

THE SEWANEE REVIEW

VOL. XVI.]

JANUARY, 1908.

[No. 1.

THE RELIGIOUS AND HOSPITABLE RITE OF FEET WASHING

THE ORIGINAL ORIENTAL CUSTOM

One of the least known religious customs of the present day is that of "feet washing," in commemoration of the washing of the disciples' feet by Christ on the occasion of the Last Supper. It is quite a common custom in the backwoods parts of the South, among the descendants of the early German immigrants in the Middle West, and in the Catholic Church. It was formerly a general practice in the Christian Church; now it is confined to the most primitive of Protestant sects and to ceremonial occasions among the Catholics.

We must go far back of the time of Christ to find the origin of ceremonial feet washing. It was, we find, an old Oriental custom, common among all peoples of the arid countries of Asia and Africa. Numerous references are found in the sacred books, especially in the Bible. Outside of the Orient it was practised by the early Greeks, and Homer described it. In the beginning it was simply an ablution, that is, a sanitary and cleanly practice. But after the manner of the Orient, most health laws became religious laws, and thus the practice of feet washing acquired a religious significance. In the hot climate of the East frequent baths were not only a luxury, but a necessity, especially to a traveller after the dusty journey of the day; hence water, the supply of which was often limited, was of vast importance and the sanitary ablution was exalted into the religious ceremony of purification. Consequently we find that ablution as a symbol of purification is frequently mentioned throughout the Bible.

There were several forms of religious ablution — the complete bath, the washing of head and hands, and feet washing. The high priest of the Jews took the ceremonial bath when he was inaugurated, and also on the Day of Atonement before each act of propitiation. Always the Jewish priests bathed the hands and feet before officiating at the Altar. Like other ceremonial customs, that of ablution gradually became more and more complex, until before the time of Christ, the Pharisees had developed it into a meaningless ritual of washings, so complicated that only a very careful person could go through it properly. Several times, directly and indirectly, Christ rebuked this useless formalism.

The ceremonial practice of feet washing had another meaning — that is, it might also be an act of friendship and hospitality; as such, it is common throughout the East to this day. The Oriental sandals allowed the feet to become soiled and chafed, and a traveller upon entering the house or a tent loosed them, not only for his own comfort, but also as an act of courtesy toward the house. It was then the duty of the host to offer water for the bathing of hands and feet, or if desiring to be very hospitable he would order a servant or a son to loose the sandals and wash the feet of the guest. Such a service was usually assigned to a slave; if performed by the son it was a high compliment to the guest; if by the host it was the highest possible mark of respect.

The Old Testament affords several illustrations of this rite of hospitality and respect. For instance, when Abraham saw the three angels in the garb of travellers, he ran to meet them, bowed down, and invited them within, saying: "Let a little water, I pray you, be fetched, and wash your feet and rest under this tree." Similarly Lot invited the wayfaring angels: "Turn in, I pray you, into your servant's house, and tarry and wash your feet." Even the servant of Abraham, out searching for a wife for Isaac, was invited into the house by Laban, who gave him "water to wash his feet and the men's feet that were with him." And when Abigail received the messengers of David, who sent her a command to come and be his wife, she expressed her appreciation by bowing herself on her face to the earth and

saying: "Behold, let thine handmaid be a servant to wash the feet of the servant of my Lord."

This ceremony of hospitality had several shades of meaning. The voluntary performance of such a duty for another signified great affection, humility and respect. Generally, however, while the custom was one of hospitality, to perform it by order, as a servant would, was considered degrading, and the degradation extended not only to the doer of the service but to the vessel used. This is shown in David's boasting speech, "Moab is my wash pot; over Edom will I cast my shoe."

DURING THE TIME OF CHRIST

Before the Christian Era these ceremonies had lost much of their old significance. On this account Christ and his disciples did not conform to the strict customs of the Pharisees in regard to ablutions, and were criticised for not doing so. Their neglect indicated disapproval of those complicated customs which no longer had any practical or religious significance. However, in the life of Christ the rite of feet washing to teach humility and show affection several times occurs. Once when he was at meat in the house of Simon the Pharisee, a woman "which was a sinner," came and "stood at his feet behind him" as he reclined on the couch in Oriental fashion, bathed his feet with her tears, wiped them with her hair and then anointed them. At the house of Simon the leper, Mary, the sister of Lazarus, anointed his feet and wiped them with her hair. The use of ointment after bathing the chafed feet of a person was especially pleasant, and was a mark of devoted and humble affection.

Christ's disapproval of the minute and lifeless observances of the Pharisees was shown in many ways. Especially was it evident in the scene at the Last Supper on the Fourteenth Nisan, when he washed the feet of his disciples. Already he had been blamed for omitting some of the ceremonial ablutions before meals; now he arises during the meal, and bathes the feet of his followers, thus breaking with the Pharisaic custom in another way.

But the prime significance of the act was in a different direction. It was a lesson in humility to the disciples who did not

even yet fully comprehend the fact that the Kingdom of Christ was not of this world. For after he had predicted the near approach of his own death they had disputed as to who should then have precedence. At other times they had entered into unseemly strife for places of honor at the meals, that is, the places nearest the head of the table. At this Last Supper in celebration of the Passover, Christ reclined at the head of the table, while to the right and left along the sides were ranged the disciples. It was under such circumstances, to rebuke former strife and to give an example of humble service, that Christ performed the act of washing the feet that is still commemorated in the most widely separated branches of the Christian Church. The following, given in the words of John, is the only description of the act that has come down to us:

Before the Passover Festival began, Jesus knew that the time had come for him to leave the world and go to the Father. He had loved those who were his own in the world, and he loved them to the last. The Devil had already put the thought of betraying Jesus into the mind of Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon; and at supper, Jesus — although knowing that the Father had put everything into his hands, and that he had come from God, and was to return to God — rose from his place, and, taking off his upper garments, tied a towel round his waist. He then poured some water into the basin, and began to wash the disciples' feet, and to wipe them with the towel which was tied around him. When he came to Simon Peter, Peter said:

"You, Master! Are you going to wash my feet?"

"You do not understand now what I am doing," replied Jesus, "but you will learn by and by."

"You shall never wash my feet!" exclaimed Peter.

"Unless I wash you," answered Jesus, "you have nothing in common with me."

"Then, Master, not my feet only," exclaimed Simon Peter, "but also my hands and my head."

"He who has bathed," replied Jesus, "has no need to wash, unless it be his feet, but is altogether clean; and you," he said to the disciples, "are clean, yet not all of you." For he knew who was going to betray him, and that was why he said "You are not all clean." When he had washed their feet, and had put on his upper garments and taken his place, he spoke to them again:

"Do you understand what I have been doing to you?" he asked. "You yourselves call me 'The Teacher' and 'The Master,' and you are right, for I am both. If I, then—'The Master' and 'The Teacher'—have washed your feet, you also ought to wash one another's feet; for I have given you an example, so that you may do just as I have done to you. In truth I tell you, a servant is not greater than his master, nor yet a messenger than the man who sends him. Now that you know these things, happy are you if you do them."¹

IN THE EARLY CATHOLIC CHURCH

From this example of humble service came the Christian ceremony. In many of the early Christian Churches the ceremony of feet washing was kept up. As a rule it came before the Lord's Supper, and during the installation of officers. However, it was not universal, no sacramental value was attached to it, and it was not considered a divinely appointed service. In the private houses of the Christians in Asia, Africa and Europe it was also practised as a simple act of civility or of hospitality. Thus in I Timothy we are told that a widow is to be honored if, among other good works, "she have washed the saints' feet." Throughout the early middle ages the custom persisted without any definite official sanction by church authorities, and, though the idea of its importance increased, it was not considered a sacrament. In the East it was more prevalent than in the West, and after the separation of the Greek and Roman Churches, it was in the former Church recognized as a sacrament, though it was never in general use.

The Western Church also gave some sanction to the sacramental idea of the ceremony. This was done by the Twentieth Council of Toledo, held in 694 in Spain, the last General Council of the Western Church for several hundred years. The third canon framed at Toledo ordered that "bishops following the example of our Lord shall observe the ceremony of washing the feet of the poor on Holy Thursday." Holy Thursday corresponded to the Fourteenth Nisan of the Jews, and was therefore the anniversary of Christ's washing of the disciples' feet. This

¹ From The Twentieth Century New Testament.

canon fixed the date for the future so far as the clergy of the Catholic Church were concerned. Before this, the proper date had been the subject of some dispute, as is mentioned by St. Augustine.

But, in spite of the action at Toledo, feet washing in the Western Church was never recognized as a sacrament, though the sacramental idea was sometimes mentioned. Bernard of Clairvaux, for example, recommended it as a *sacramentum remissionis peccatorum quotidianorum*. In the Cathedral at Milan, Ambrose practised the ceremony regularly, though not as a sacrament.

The custom was gradually discontinued among the laity of the Church in the West, and was transformed into a splendid ceremony celebrated at the coronations of kings and emperors and at the installation of Popes and other high ecclesiastical officials. The custom now was for the personage crowned or installed to bathe the feet of twelve old men. Thus the practice remained during the unity of the Western Church.

IN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AFTER THE REFORMATION

After the Protestant Revolution the observance of the custom was continued, but was not uniform among the several divisions of Christians. The Roman Catholics continued as before. In the Greek Church it was gradually discontinued until it survived only in Greek monasteries, on great occasions in the Church, and at the Russian court, where it is still a splendid ceremony.

The Armenians retained it. Their confession says: *Christus pedes discipulorum suorum lavit, ut lueret peccatum pedum Adami, qui ad scientiæ lignum ambulaverat* — Christ washed the feet of his disciples in order to atone for the wrong of the feet of Adam, who had walked to the tree of knowledge.

In Roman Catholic countries the ceremony is still celebrated on great occasions at the Vatican, at the Courts of Vienna, Madrid, Munich and Lisbon, and in convents and cathedrals. It is always a splendid service. Usually twelve poor old men are chosen, who have their feet washed by King, Emperor or Pope, and then receive gifts. The ceremony at the Austrian

Court is, after that at Rome, the most splendid. It always takes place on Holy Thursday, or Thursday of the week before Easter. The day is sometimes called *Dies Mandati* or *Dies Cœnæ*, because of the commandment given by Christ and the Last Supper on that day of the first Christian feet washing. The ceremony itself is called *Pedilavium*, or *Lavatorio*, or *Mandatum*, after the first word of the antiphony chanted during the ceremony. In the cathedrals the participants are arrayed in white vestments, and the principal priest or bishop, assisted by deacon and sub-deacon, goes through the form of washing the feet of twelve, sometimes thirteen, poor men.

THE CEREMONY AT THE VATICAN

The finest ceremony is that at the Vatican. It was most splendid about the middle of the nineteenth century, and there was always a vast crowd to see it. It took place in the Clementine Chapel and was preceded by the "stripping of the altars" of lights, flowers and ornaments, in memory of the stripping of the garments from Christ. Then followed the feet washing — *pedilavium* or *mandatum*. To prepare for it, the throne and other signs of royalty were placed in the chapel. Then came thirteen poor priests in loose white robes and white caps, who took seats on a high bench, and each bared a well scrubbed right foot. The Pope next entered, with attendant priests all dressed in white, carrying the train of his robe and bearing towels. A splendid apron was incensed and placed over the fine robes of the Pontiff, who proceeded to the *pedilavium*. A sub-deacon lifted the bare foot of one of the poor men, the Pope knelt, sprinkled on the foot a few drops of water from a silver basin, and, after rubbing it with a towel, he kissed it and passed on to the next pilgrim, as the poor priest was called. The entire ceremony lasted about two minutes. The object of the ceremony as officially stated was "to give the Pontiff the opportunity of learning and practising a lesson of humility."

The music is always chosen to fit the occasion, and during the washing of the pilgrims' feet the choir sang the antiphon *Mandatum Novum*, so called from its first words; it is the Vulgate Version of John 13:34: *Mandatum novum do vobis ut diligatis*

invicem: sicut dilexi vos, et ut vos diligatis invicem — "I give you a new commandment: Love one another; love one another as I have loved you" — the words of Christ at the Last Supper after he had washed the feet of the disciples.

After the *pedilavium* came the serving of the meal. The Pope, with the assistance of attendant priests, bathed his hands and, in the *Salla della Tavola*, served a meal to the thirteen poor priests whose feet he had just washed. Kneeling priests handed the dishes to the Pope, who passed them to the poor men, blessed them and then went away. After the bountiful meal, the pilgrims were given the clothes they wore, the towels, some money, and the leavings of the dinner.

The *Lavatorio* at the Court of Spain is an interesting survival of the feet washing custom. It has been revived since Alfonso XIII became of age. On Holy Thursday the young monarch washes the feet of twenty-five poor people — thirteen beggar men and twelve old women — chosen from the poor of the city of Madrid. Care is taken that they are in good physical and moral health, and before the ceremony begins the right leg of each is washed, disinfected by the court doctors and then perfumed. At the beginning of the service the household priests, acolytes, nobles and guards march in with music and song and range themselves about the hall in which the beggars are seated. Then an archbishop gives a basin to the King, who washes and kisses the feet of the poor people. A dinner follows, gifts are made, and the beggars are dismissed.

IN THE PROTESTANT CHURCHES OF EUROPE

In the Protestant Churches of Europe the ceremony has been quite unlike that in the Catholic Church. Though many of the early Protestants practised the rite, it was mainly in its primitive form. Luther strongly condemned and ridiculed "this hypocritical foot washing" as practised by the higher clergy on ceremonial occasions. He declared that the higher officials who performed such acts of false humility later evened up by more arrogant conduct toward inferiors; better a bath all over he said, with no religious element about it; as it was, the ceremony was of no value because the heart was not humble. So the Lutheran

churches did not recognize the custom, though some of their members clung to it. In 1718, for instance, a Lutheran church of Dresden formally disciplined twelve members who had allowed the humble-spirited Duke Maurice William of Saxony to prove his humility by washing their feet.

In the Anglican Church the more elaborate Catholic form was at first celebrated. On Holy Thursday, or Maundy Thursday (so called, it is said, from *Mandatum Novum*) the ceremony was observed in great style at Whitehall, where the Bishop of London washed the feet of a number of poor people equal to the number of years of the sovereign's reign. Later this was discontinued, and with it disappeared from the Protestant churches the elaborate celebration of feet washing as a religious custom.

On the other hand, the primitive form of the act survives to the present day, mainly among churches composed of plain people. After the Protestant Revolution, though the Lutherans and Calvinists repudiated the ceremony, the radical sects of Protestants retained or revived it. The most notable of these were the Anabaptists, the Moravians and the Mennonites. The Anabaptists of Germany of the sixteenth century considered it a sacrament instituted and commended by Christ, and the scattered remnants of these people clung to it wherever they went.

The Moravians, of whom Count Zinzendorf was the best known, long considered feet washing as a sacrament and practised it from the sixteenth to the nineteenth century, but have now discontinued it. By them it was called the "lesser baptism," and was performed not only by the officials for the members but by the latter for one another. During the ceremony they sang a hymn relating to the circumstances of the Last Supper.

The Mennonites, or followers of Simon Menno, another German sect dating from the sixteenth century, have kept up the custom. The Flemish branch of this sect, stricter than the others, has more regularly practised it. In Germany the Mennonites held it as not only a religious rite but also an act of hospitality — the Oriental idea. To wash the feet of strangers who came within their doors was considered a duty divinely commanded.

AMONG AMERICAN PROTESTANTS

I. *The "Hardshells."*—In America the ceremonial feet washing is found among several organizations of primitive Protestants. Of these there are two distinct divisions, those composed mainly of members of foreign descent, and those whose membership is of English-American origin. The feet washing organizations of the latter are found mainly in the backwoods and mountain districts of the South and Southwest. They include such sects as the "Original Free Will Baptists," the "Baptist Church of Christ," the "United Baptists," the "Primitive Baptists" or "Hardshells," the "Old School Baptists," the "Anti-Mission Baptists," the "Old Two-Seed-in-the-Spirit Predestinarian Baptists," and the "Seventh Day Adventists." The last named body is in other respects unlike the Baptist organizations; it is found in the Middle States and West; in this church the Adventists wash one another's feet at the time of the celebration of the Lord's Supper.

The closely related bodies of Baptists known as "Old School," "United Baptists," "Anti-Mission," "Primitive," or "Hardshell," and "Baptist Church of Christ"—all found in the remote South, and by outsiders called "Hardshell," believe that "feet washing should be practised by all believers," and they consider it a gospel ordinance that must be continued until the second coming of Christ. At a conference held at Wilton, Maine, in 1831, the "Free Will Baptists," in order to end a controversy in the church, decided that "washing the saints' feet" should be no longer official, but voluntary with each congregation. Some congregations in the Carolinas then drew apart and called themselves the "Original Free Will Baptists." At their quarterly meetings they "wash the saints' feet." From West Virginia to Texas are spread the hill and mountain churches of the "Old Two-Seed-in-the-Spirit Predestinarian Baptists," a distinctly Manichean sect, who have feet washing along with the celebration of the Lord's Supper. These bodies of Christians are growing smaller each year. As the backwoods disappears in the South the small primitive denominations gradually give way to or are absorbed into the Regular Baptists and other churches,

and the custom of feet washing then lapses. At the present time, feet washing Baptists frequently have to go ten to twenty-five miles to church. They build few new church buildings and the old ones are usually in districts from which the "Hardshells," as they are called, have disappeared.

To the reverent mind there is nothing absurd about the Southern "piney woods" feet washing. On communion days the brothers and sisters scrub their feet until they shine and put on their best home knit white stockings; at church they take seats on the front benches and bare the feet. Two dignified old brothers, each with a towel over his shoulder and a "noggin" or "foot tub" of water, proceed to wash the feet of the men. Women do the same for one another, and the negro members, if there are any, do likewise for themselves.

The ceremony means much to these people; it is performed in a reverent and dignified manner, and is an impressive sight to some strangers, but to the ungodly small boy, say of a Methodist or Presbyterian family, there is something inexpressibly ludicrous about it. Sometimes the good old "Hardshell" preacher directs a scorching rebuke at these young "limbs of Satan" who show signs of irreverence. The "Hardshell" sects are greatly annoyed by the visitors who out of curiosity crowd to the church on feet washing days and gaze in at the doors or stand up on the back seats to see the ceremony. Under such circumstances it is not strange that the young "Hardshells" sometimes refuse to take part, and are often lost to the church of their fathers through fear of ridicule. The Southern "Hardshells" are fine, plain people, but soon there will be no more of them, for their number is rapidly decreasing.

In the central parishes of Louisiana are found negro churches that preserve the custom of feet washing. The members are descendants of French negro slaves, and speak an Acadian dialect. They call themselves Baptists, but celebrate the Feast Days and Saints' Days, and retain other Catholic customs. With them the ceremony of feet washing comes once a year, at the Watch Night services.

II. *The German Sectarians.*—The principal religious sects in America of foreign origin that practice ceremonial feet washing are the "Church of God," the Mennonites, the "River Brethren," the "Amish Brethren" and the Dunkards, or German Baptists. With them the act is classed as one of three perpetual ordinances of divine institution — baptism, feet washing and the Lord's Supper. All of these sects are of German origin. They are the spiritual — often lineal — descendants of those radical non-Catholics who refused to follow Martin Luther on account of his conservatism and because of his hostility to the lower classes during the Peasants' War in 1525. These sects are found in Pennsylvania, Maryland, West Virginia, and the Middle West.

The Mennonites in the United States "wash the saints' feet" twice a year after the Lord's Supper; the men and women wait on each other separately; after the feet washing, the right hand of Christian fellowship is given and with it the "kiss of peace" from brother to brother, and from sister to sister. The Mennonites and other Germans wash one foot only; the Southern "Hardshells" often wash both feet.

Of the "River Brethren," there are three branches: The "Yorker Brethren" or "Old Order;" the "Brethren in Christ;" and "United Zion's Children." In the last named branch one person performs the entire ceremony — washing and drying; in the others one washes the feet and another dries them.

The "Dunkards" and "Amish" celebrate the feet washing at the time of the Lord's Supper. The "Dunkards" begin the service at "early candle lighting." The men are seated on one side of the meeting place, the women on the other. Large tubs of slightly warmed water are brought in; the men and women on the front seats bare the right foot; then on the men's side a brother washes the feet of those on the front row. The washer, after he washes a man's foot, offers him his right hand and gives him the "kiss of peace." After the washer follows a second brother with a towel to dry the feet. By him also is given the hand of fellowship and the "kiss of peace." On the women's side the same procedure takes place. Then those on the first row retire to the back seats and others come forward. During

the ceremony the minister or reader makes an appropriate talk on the lesson to be taught, or reads selections from the Bible on humility, charity, service, etc. After the *pedilavium*, as they call it, comes a supper (not communion) of soup served on long tables; all partake in commemoration of "the Lord's real supper." After this supper the right hand and kiss of peace are again given and then follows the communion.

The "Amish" ceremony is slightly different. It comes sometimes before and sometimes after the Lord's Supper. A sermon is first preached on the thirteenth chapter of John. Then the brothers and sisters seated with their backs to the communion table remove shoes and stockings. On the men's side two preachers put on aprons and each washes and dries the feet of the man nearest. Then, after the right hand of fellowship and the kiss of charity have been exchanged, the washers give aprons and water to those whose feet have been washed, and thus the ceremony proceeds. Likewise two women at a time wash the feet of the women. During the ceremony there is appropriate singing. After the *pedilavium*, they kneel in prayer, then stand, and beginning with the chief preacher, every other man, first, third, fifth, etc., turns to his neighbor on the left and gives him the hand of fellowship and kisses him. The women among themselves do likewise, and then each married man kisses his wife.

The *pedilavium* in the North and West is more elaborate than the feet washing of the South. In the North also sightseers annoy the congregations and the young people, sensitive to ridicule, avoid the ceremonies, which are dying out, though more slowly than in the South.

WALTER L. FLEMING.

Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge.

PROFESSOR MUTHER'S THEORIES ON ART *

This is probably the most interesting art history ever written. The style is animated, vigorous and direct. It deals not with dates and details, but with the great movements of human thought. It sees in art a vital manifestation of the spirit of the times. To anyone seriously concerned with the subject, it is more entertaining than any novel.

But, while probably the most interesting art history, it is far from being the most judicious. The author carries to an extreme Taine's view that art is only a product of the age, and does not attach sufficient importance to the unaccountable power of genius. He attains his effects by violent contrasts of light and shade. He belongs to the school of writers that has lately arisen in Germany, who have cast off the old complex, interwoven method of German composition, who express themselves with an almost brutal vigor, and who lay on the lights and shades with scant regard to those delicate gradations, those nice distinctions, that are essential to the accurate expression of the truth.

The author, in order to enforce his principle that art is merely a product of its surroundings, takes the strangest liberties with chronology. For example, in reading his book, you would imagine that there was an age of Savonarola, distinguished by great religious fervor, followed by an age of Leonardo da Vinci, characterized by a pagan reaction; when in fact, both were born in the year 1452, and labored on side by side, exerting their greatest influence at the same time. Or he will indulge in such expressions as this: "But they apply to the art which ruled in Italy from Leonardo to Correggio. The epoch of eroticism and of sensuality was followed by one of unapproachable majesty" (p. 355). And he goes on to treat of Michelangelo. In reality, all of Michelangelo's important works were finished before Correggio died, and most of them were produced while both

* Muther's "History of Painting from the Fourth to the Nineteenth Century." New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1907.

he and Leonardo were at the height of their power. Or he will venture on such generalizations as this: "The fifteenth century, with its taste for sharp, angular lines, loved also in landscape, jagged, harsh outlines, and depicted it in the angular barrenness of its forms" (p. 362). The greatest master of landscape of the fifteenth century was Perugino, and nothing can excel the gracious suavity of the scenes that he depicts; and there were many others who treated landscape in the same way, though with less consummate skill.

In the author's pursuit of the sensual there is something morbid and unwholesome. His attitude is that of a monk, not of a sane, healthy human being. He sees sensuality in the strangest places. The greatest and most refined intellect that ever devoted itself to art was unquestionably Leonardo. So far as we know, he never loved any woman. He was wedded exclusively to his art and to the things of the mind. No picture, no drawing of his, has any taint of sensuality. Even his Leda, if we may judge by the copies that have come down to us, is as pure as a Greek statue. But our author sees in Leonardo only a gross sensualist, who swept the world on to perdition. So, nothing could be more innocent than the sweet joy and youthful beauty that Correggio loves; but to Professor Muther's jaundiced vision he is a monster of perverse eroticism. Amongst all Correggio's delicious pictures there is not one that could offend a normal taste; but Dr. Muther would have them all burned as a menace to public morals. So the aristocratic elegance of Van Dyck, which is so valuable a lesson to us all, teaching us dignity, repose, grace and self-restraint, is in our author's view only a vile degeneracy. To the ordinary mortal these elegant cavaliers of Van Dyck's are types of the perfect gentleman; to Dr. Muther they are weaklings exhausted by their vices, and worthy only of contempt. And strange to say, while he discovers sensuality in the most unexpected quarters, he finds in Titian, the glorious leader of the pagan revival, the high priest of Venus, only purity and lofty aspirations, and he has the highest opinion of Boucher and Fragonard. The statement that to the pure all things are pure is no doubt an exaggeration; but certain it is that purity is not manifested by a morbid search for the impure.

Nothing is more unfounded than the great importance that Professor Muther attributes to Savonarola's influence on art. One would imagine from reading the book that the monk of San Marco revolutionized painting throughout Italy and brought in an era of universal righteousness. In point of fact, he had absolutely no influence on art outside of Florence, and not much there. It is true that he put Piero di Cosimo's quaint pagan fancies out of fashion and spoiled Botticelli, causing him to paint such unpleasant works as the Munich "Entombment" instead of pictures like the "Spring" and the "Birth of Venus." He probably made Fra Bartolommeo more solemn and pompous than he would otherwise have been. He no doubt influenced Michelangelo spiritually, but apparently not in his art; for that deals only with the nude, which Savonarola hated with monkish bigotry. Elsewhere in Italy the painters and sculptors wrought on, wholly oblivious of the monk who was thundering in Florence.

Professor Muther indulges in such unfounded remarks as this respecting Titian: "To this mature old age, long after Giorgione rested under the sod, his most important works belong." In reality, Titian is the greatest of all examples in favor of Dr. Osler's theory. He lived to be ninety-nine, in robust health, painting to the end; but now that we know that his "Presentation of the Virgin in the Temple" was a work of his younger days, we know that all his pictures that are widely popular save the "Venus and the Graces" of the Borghese Gallery were painted in comparative youth.

The author's northern bias is shown by his giving twenty-four pages to Rembrandt and only twelve to Raphael. Not that the twenty-four pages are too much for the mighty Dutchman. On the contrary, every word is good, and we only wish that there were more. But in Raphael he sees only a clever adapter of other men's ideas, and does not realize that while the Prince of Painters was the most receptive of men, he fused all his acquisitions in the marvellous alembic of his genius until the result was a perfect harmony, the like of which the world has never seen elsewhere.

These are a few peculiarities of the work, but there are many more that will strike the judicious reader. Still it is a book

which compels thought, and every one interested in art should read it.

The translation by Professor Kriehn of Leland Stanford University is most admirably done. The English could not be clearer or more vigorous. The translator, however, undertakes to add notes; and as the work will no doubt go through several editions, it may not be amiss to call attention to several inaccuracies. On page 134, Van der Goes' great altar piece is said to be in Santa Maria Nuova. This was true when Professor Muther wrote; but for some years it has been one of the greatest ornaments of the Uffizi. On page 136 this picture is spoken of as an "Adoration of the Kings," when it is an "Adoration of the Shepherds." On page 180, he says, in speaking of Botticelli, "the 'Birth of Venus' is now in the Florentine Academy and the 'Primavera' in the Uffizi Gallery," when the truth is the exact reverse of this. On page 185, he transfers Botticelli's "Entombment" from Munich to Florence. On page 212, he says that Perugino's "Crucifixion" is in the Church of Santa Maria Maddalena dei Pazzi, when it is in the refectory of the Monastery. On page 235, he speaks of driving on a fine afternoon from Florence to the Certosa of Pavia. Evidently Milan or Pavia is intended as the starting point. He calls Leonardo's "Madonna of the Rocks" the "Madonna of the Grotto." This may be very good German, but in English it is apt to mislead. On page 243, Sanazzaro, the great scholar, masquerades as "Sazzanarzo." On page 528, the protruding jaw of the Hapsburgs is transformed into a receding one. On page 578, Goya's "Maya Clothed" is said to be in the Academy of San Fernando, when for some years it has hung in the Prado. It may be very good German to call Fra Angelico merely "Fiesole," as Professor Muther does throughout; but in the English version he should be given the name by which he is universally known among us.

GEORGE B. ROSE.

Little Rock, Arkansas.

PHASES IN THE EDUCATIONAL MOVEMENT OF THE DAY

I. THE SCHOOL AS THE EXPONENT OF DEMOCRACY IN THE SOUTH

The progress which the South is making in education will constitute an epoch in the history of our country. The strides are such as to thrill the heart. Time would fail one to recall all the advances. The people are aroused; fine school buildings are rising in towns and rural districts; salaries of teachers increased; the school terms lengthened; better supervision afforded; richer courses of study introduced; local taxes raised in thousands of communities; scattered small schools consolidated into strong ones; high schools multiplied by the hundred; colleges enriched in men and money; and, in a word, everywhere abounding enthusiasm displaying itself in constructive power. It is a splendid spectacle to see a great people thus girding themselves with strength in their firm resolve to give a chance to every child.

Such display of social energy would be memorable on any account, but when you consider the noble purpose which has animated our citizens in their efforts to improve the schools, their labors command the highest admiration. The school is the epitome of the South's problem. Education represents a structural process in society. Many wonderful forces in nature have recently been discovered for the use of man, such as steam, coal and electricity; and these are transforming the earth. But the South has found in the school the latent potency that will create industries, uplift the masses, adjust racial differences, and regain political prestige. The purpose, therefore, that stirs our people is even more admirable than the power which they have put forth in the improvement of their schools. An interpretation of the spirit and aim of the South in the present educational revival is necessary in order to understand the statesmanship that underlies it and the social tendencies out of which it springs.

The emancipation of the common man is the first task of the

school. The social stratification of the South prior to the Civil War has been briefly described by an eminent publicist, Dr. Albert Shaw, in his recent work on "Political Problems of American Development:" "The slavery system lifted perhaps one million white people to the position of a favored class, and led to the neglect and relative decline of the South's most valuable possession, namely, its five or six millions of plain white people of old American stock, who have very little property and few advantages. For the great majority of the four million negroes, slavery meant an immeasurable improvement in their lot, when compared with their condition in Africa. In any just estimate, the disadvantaged people — for whom the philanthropists and reformers of the North should have lifted up their voices — were not the slaves, but the disinherited and neglected masses of white population."

Now, in this educational crusade we are seeking, not privileges for a class nor the happiness of the individual alone, but the well-being of society as a whole, and especially the development of the "poor whites," who were once ground between the upper millstone of aristocracy and the nether one of slavery. After all, is not the common man the great asset of democracy? The inspiration of this revival came long ago to an apostle upon the housetop at Joppa: "God has showed me that I should call no man common." We are invoking every agency of civilization and progress to raise the neglected white people of the South to industrial prosperity, social efficiency and independence in political action. Confidence in the capacity of the average man is the creed of this crusade.

The bond of union in democracy is likemindedness. It is identity in habit, in modes of thought, in sentiment and aspiration that bind people together under a free government and make for social order. "Can two walk together except they be agreed?" is a fundamental in democracy, which is a form of fraternalism. In the olden time a State might be composed of many diverse elements in race, custom and self-interest, as they were held by force in common subjection to a single sovereign. But in democracy the cohesive principle is sympathy, each citizen recognizing himself as a member of one body, in which if one

member suffers, all suffer. Democracy, accordingly, revealed novel cleavages in the old political organization. It grouped the several peoples anew, not according to the ambition of a particular monarch, but according to the subtle affinities that gave effect to the bonds of union in each nation. Hence, nationality followed hard upon the heels of democracy, as effect flows from cause. Fraternity of feeling came to mark the boundary of every State, intensifying the consciousness of national unity and setting free locked-up energies in the joyous discovery of a people's personality and its mission among mankind. It was this electric force of nationality that transformed the map of Europe in the nineteenth century, unifying according to racial instinct Italy, Germany, Holland, Belgium, Greece, Roumania and Norway. And it is this same force which is to-day acting as the dissolvent of the polyglot empire of Austria-Hungary, each nation of which wishes to set up housekeeping for itself and live under its own vine and fig tree.

Now, the bane of slavery was that it engendered differences in economic conditions, social customs and political ideals in the two sections of our country. The evils of slavery did not end with the slave. Indeed, its discipline was a stage toward his development. The danger in the "peculiar institution" was that it separated the South from the rest of the country by sectional idiosyncracies, and, therefore, paralyzed the effect of those spiritual affinities which constitute alone the real bonds of a modern nation under democracy.

Education is the most effectual means of unifying our people. It at once breaks down social caste in the South and assimilates us in habit and sentiment with all other sections of our common country. The school releases the South from isolation and makes for a national spirit.

If the people are to rule progressively, there must be a party of action and a party of criticism. The one is as essential as the other. The proof of this appears in the excellence of the English government which has made the function of criticism the prime duty of the opposition party, and vested it with dignity and power. If eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, it is to be had only by the free and frank discussion of all public

issues. What the bastille was to the absolute monarch, that and more is gag rule to the boss or the political machine. Owing to slavery with its repressive influences before the war, and owing to the dominance of a single party since that time, the South has suffered from a lack of free discussion of public matters and from the absence of independent action in politics. Yet the task of the Southern statesmen after the war was a most serious one, and right nobly did they face it, deserving thereby the gratitude of all friends of Anglo-Saxon civilization.

Democracy is the act of combining the common judgment of the citizens. For them to form an enlightened judgment, discussion is necessary; and for them to express the judgment thus formed, independence in action is essential. The chief ingredient of every vote should be reason and conscience, not tradition nor blind loyalty to party solidity. Identity in spirit and diversity in opinion are both desirable in democracy; the first for stability and the second for progress. Party solidity in the South has been the hey-day of the demagogue, who boasts of his sectionalism as a substitute for patriotism.

The present educational revival in the South has done much to quicken free inquiry as to economic and political affairs and has offered in every State a forum for the discussion of common concerns. The sound political instincts of our people have asserted themselves anew under these favorable auspices. Education has become the platform of the party of progress. The school, the public library, the rural mail delivery, the daily paper, telephone, and better roads are common agencies in energizing the intelligence of the masses of the people and making them restive under the servile control too often exercised by professional politicians. An idea is surcharged with activity, as a drop of dew contains expansive energies. The school radiates creative ideas and influences, quickening the initiative of the people and breaking up the dead uniformities in opinion and action.

A prime lesson for the leaders in this movement to learn is, in standing for the real interests of the people, not to be afraid of the politician. He frightens at his own shadow. We have gone far enough in this progressive work to find that out. Our experi-

ence in this regard recalls a remark of that brilliant French nobleman, Montesquieu: "At first, I had in most cases a puerile dread of the great; as soon as I had found them out, I began almost immediately to despise them."

Government used to mean a monarch, courtiers and warriors, diplomacy abroad and political intrigue at home—something of splendor that dazzled from afar the eyes of mankind. But to-day the State is absorbed in the life of the people. Especially is this the sphere of rightful action for a commonwealth in our Union. Virginia, for instance, sends no ambassadors to foreign courts. She has no navy. There is nothing at Richmond that smacks of the regal. On the contrary, our State is trying to improve the farms, make good roads, open the mines, protect the oyster industry, quicken manufactures, insure social order, care for the helpless, and train the young. Politics has become domestic, and identical with the welfare of the masses. Long ago that prophet of the nineteenth century, Mazzini, said, "Every political question is becoming a social question."

Whether or not it be true that the Federal power is encroaching upon the sphere of the State in affairs of National import, it is certain that the Commonwealth is localizing its activities and setting its own house in order. This is a happy augury. If we had formerly put more emphasis on States' Duties, we should not have had to spend our blood and treasure in behalf of States' Rights. We have been made too often the football of outside issues. Our public men are becoming again shepherds of the people. Now, among these homely tasks of a democratic government, none is superior to the training of the youth. "The chief business of constructive politics is to make sure of the future through the training of the young and the transmission of ideas." Education is the biggest business Virginia has on hand. The State spends more money on its schools than on any other interest, and employs more people as teachers than all other officials. The payroll of the school is the largest item in Virginia's budget. The changing sphere of the State is strikingly illustrated by the fact that to-day women, as teachers, constitute the most important body of public servants in the employ of the Commonwealth.

This educational revival is rooting self-government anew in the neighborhood. Community effort has been its keynote. Jefferson said: "Those wards, called townships in New England, are the vital principle of their governments, and have proved themselves the wisest invention ever devised by the wit of man for the perfect exercise of self-government, and for its preservation. . . . Divide the counties into wards." Such is taking place to-day. This tendency has shown itself especially in two ways. First, by local school improvement leagues, which are made up of the citizens of the community, and which have as their end the betterment of the neighborhood school. More than three hundred such leagues have been planted in Virginia, and they are found numerous in many other Southern States. In the meetings of these leagues many aspects of local life come up for discussion and review. The school is thus becoming the nucleating centre of social activities for the Southern community. Secondly, local taxation involves self-help and community control — essentials in democracy. The sole basis of a solid public school system is local taxation. Of the eighteen million dollars spent upon her schools, Massachusetts raises ninety-six per cent by local taxation. The South is recognizing this principle. Five years ago, North Carolina raised in school taxes less than \$16,000. The past year it has raised about \$450,000. Such an advance registers, like a thermometer, not only the citizens' zeal in education, but also the increased vitality of community government. Last year Virginia raised by local taxation for the schools \$1,303,900, which was an increase for the past five years of \$318,000, or an advance of twenty-four per cent. The present year will make a far finer exhibit. Not a few communities in Virginia have raised their local taxes to the maximum under the Constitution. Should we call this taxation? The word usually suggests what a citizen pays for a negative benefit, such as the maintenance of courts, policemen, and other governmental expenses. Taxes for the schools, on the contrary, are an investment for the individual and for the community. Every dollar put into the right sort of education brings its return at home in the increased initiative, skill and intelligence and moral power of our people.

The sorrow of the South did not end with slavery, which was itself only an aspect of the permanent struggle for racial adjustment. Bismarck found the solution of Germany's problem in "blood and iron." Cavour through diplomacy wrought out the unification of Italy. A parliament will satisfy the aspiration for freedom of the Russian people. China, by adopting Western civilization, is emerging from the isolation of centuries and entering, perhaps, upon a future of influence among modern nations. But in the solution of the South's problem, no ready remedy such as these is applicable. The malady is chronic, and the swift stroke of the surgeon's knife will not avail.

In the tedious process of racial adjustment spirit holds the chief place. The uniqueness of our situation lies in this fact. We must rely upon the efficacy of social forces, such as the sense of justice and the desire of mutual helpfulness, which are slow in their growth and subtle in their influence. Every agency, therefore, which energizes reason and conscience in our people is a factor in working out our distinctive task of racial adjustment. The school is the genesis of such mental and moral forces. Regarded in this light, the South is subjecting the school to the supremest test of social efficiency to which it was ever put. Can we so enlighten and moralize the masses of our people as to insure the supremacy of law over mob violence, to allay prejudice and make reason regnant, to put humanity above self-interest? To accomplish these things is the specific mission of the school in the South. It is to enforce the Golden Rule, and to embody the spirit of the Good Samaritan.

Industrialism and democracy are twins. Not until machinery released the masses from the stunting effect of continual toil for bread did they have a margin of time and a surplus of energy to devote to mental improvement, social service and political initiative. Three men can now raise enough food to feed a thousand. Steam and electricity have been reduced to serfdom, and man has been emancipated. Volcanic was the French Revolution, but more potent by far was the industrial revolution which was silently taking place at the same time across the channel in England.

This industrial awakening is now sweeping through the

South, which under the old order was given over almost wholly to agriculture. The factory and farm stand to-day side by side. How to convert the raw materials of ore, timber and cotton into finished products for the use of man is the standing challenge to the skill and organizing ability of the South. It is the business of the school to develop the practical intelligence and technical skill necessary to exploit the natural resources in this extensive domain. Education here is addressing itself to the recovery of exhausted soils and to the diffusion of sound economic ideas.

These industrial changes are bringing social crises. The community about the cotton mill attracts, as a magnet, families from the stagnant life of the backward districts. Old social bonds are broken and new ones must be formed. Often the condition of these transplanted families is bettered at the expense of the children, who are put to work for long hours amid the roar of machinery in the mills. Here, again, the school stands face to face with a new set of problems that press for solution.

Such are the motive forces working in the Southern school to-day. It is at once the exponent of economic efficiency, racial adjustment, and national spirit. Wrestling with gigantic difficulties, the South has summoned to its aid the genii of skill, intelligence, national conciliation, and human brotherhood, and has found with joyous surprise all of these beneficent agencies operative in the school.

S. C. MITCHELL.

Richmond College, Virginia.

II. COMPULSORY EDUCATION AND THE SOUTHERN STATES

Even in a cursory examination of the subject it will be necessary to sketch the experiences of European countries and American States. Statistics will necessarily occupy a prominent place in such a sketch, as these are essential to an intelligent understanding of this important educational question. These may appear prolix, yet they are the meat of the subject.

First, as to European countries: The Germans were the earliest to institute a system of general education, and the wonder-

ful progress of Germany in every respect is now largely attributed to the thoroughness of national education. Especially in the last twenty years has the aspect of the nation been greatly changed. Some attribute this to the large number of special technical schools, which are also undoubtedly potent factors, but some more organic reason in the national life must be discovered. The English consul, Mr. Powell, in an interesting report on these conditions, says that this (commercial and industrial) success is due less to superior commercial education than to the high state of general education that Germany has enjoyed for many years, which was formerly lacking, and is even now lacking in several essential points in Great Britain.

The fact that in Germany elementary education has been generally compulsory and, to a large extent, also gratuitous, for more than one hundred and fifty years, is recognized to be an essential element in recent political, industrial and commercial successes of the nation. Nothing short of a general uplifting of the mass of the people will raise a nation to a higher level in all respects. In England and in the United States, until the middle of the nineteenth century, compulsory school attendance was justly considered an infringement of civil liberty, and this view prevented the passage and successful execution of such compulsory school laws. In Germany, since Luther, the fact has frequently been dwelt upon that parents are not always the most pious, conscientious and far-sighted educators.

In the beginning, compulsory education is always felt to be severe, and meets with energetic contradiction and opposition. In the course of time, however, the masses become reconciled, and the law enforcing regular school attendance in elementary schools is recognized as a protection; yet its suspension would be followed by a noticeable falling off of attendance in the most advanced States. Various German States — Hesse, Württemberg, Gotha, and others — had qualified educational laws in the seventeenth century. But education did not become truly compulsory in the Kingdom of Prussia until the decree of Frederick William I, September 28th, 1717. This memorable decree required that wherever schools existed, parents, under penalty of the laws, were obliged to send their children to school, paying

a tuition fee of six pence a week for each child. Frederick the Great, in 1763, defined the provisions with greater exactness. By a cabinet order of King Frederick William III, in 1825, compulsory education was extended to all parts of the kingdom, this being the basis of the present State law of Prussia, and other parts of the German Empire have similar statutes.

In practice, the child between six and fourteen is required to attend school. The number of children between six and fourteen years of age in school has increased from 12.2 per cent of the total population in 1822 to 17 per cent in 1895. The chief gain has been in bringing the proportion of girls up to that of boys. In the United States, the tendency is now the reverse, the girls getting the greater advantages of the schools.

It may be of interest to note the provisions of other European countries as to compulsory education. In the Austrian crown lands, the period during which school attendance is compulsory is from six to eight years. In Hungary, from six to twelve. In Sweden, from nine to fifteen. In Norway, from ten to fourteen. In Denmark, from seven to fourteen. In England, by the law of 1870, local school boards are left to pass special ordinances introducing compulsory attendance. These regulations, together with the factory laws of 1878, which require all children working in the factories to attend school at least five times a week until their thirteenth year, have made instruction virtually general and compulsory. The Netherlands have no compulsory law, but boards of teachers and college directors are supposed to establish a regular attendance of children from six to twelve years of age by means of exhortations, circulation of roll calls and indirect compulsory measures, such as the withdrawal of public support. In Belgium no compulsory education exists. France has, since 1882, required attendance from six to thirteen. In Italy, from six to ten. Russia has no compulsory education law. While in Germany, the percentage of elementary pupils in attendance, to all population, is about 17, in Belgium, it is 11.10; Denmark, 12.87; France, 14.47; Greece, 6.19; Great Britain and Ireland, 15.45; Italy, 8.14; Netherlands, 14.25; Austria, 13.40; Hungary, 12.59; Bosnia, 2.70; Portugal,

4.60; Roumania, 4.41; Russia-in-Europe, 1.03; Finland, 18.29; Sweden, 16.37; Norway, 17.02; Switzerland, 15.73; Servia, 3.38; and Spain, 10.95.

As an example of what is being done for education in Europe, the Kingdom of Prussia alone may be cited. In addition to the elementary schools, there are about twelve general continuation schools, with 8,718 pupils; 1,320 industrial continuation schools, with 145,672 pupils; 97 trade schools, with 8,625 pupils; 217 commercial schools, with 17,029 pupils; 1,193 agricultural schools, with 23,831 pupils; a total of 2,989 continuation and technical schools, with 219,490 pupils. The German believes in education. As showing the thoroughness and zeal with which the government supplies the means of technical training in the various industries of the country, it is stated that if any paper, dealing, for example, with some department of the textile industry, is read before any foreign society and is published or appears in any journal, the communication is immediately translated and circulated throughout the textile schools of Prussia, with directions to have it dealt with as a lecture to students, and if models, illustrations or lantern slides are required by way of illustration, they are prepared and sent with the paper. The German is surveying the world for ideas.

As showing the relation of the compulsory school system in Germany and other European States to illiteracy, the following statistics of adults are suggestive: German Empire, .05 per cent are illiterate; Denmark, .02; Finland, .49; Switzerland, .13; Scotland, 2.46; Netherlands, 2.30; England, 3.00; France, 4.70; Belgium (not compulsory), 10.10; Austria, 35.60; Ireland, 7.90; Hungary, 47.80; Greece, 30.00; Italy, 32.99; Portugal, 79.20; Spain, 68.10; Russia, 61.70; Servia, 79.30; Roumania, 88.40. Our immigration is now principally from Italy, Hungary and Russia.

France offers a good illustration of the rapidity with which illiteracy may be reduced as a result of good attendance laws. In 1854, no less than 42.5 per cent of the French people were illiterate. In 1870, at the end of the Empire, 31 per cent were illiterate, and in 1880 the condition was very little improved. In 1882, the compulsory education act went into effect and as a

result, in 1900, the illiteracy had been reduced to 6 per cent — only one-fifth of what it was eighteen years before.

Now, let us see what has been done in our own country, and especially in the Southern States. The conditions in America have been entirely different from those in Europe. The work of popular education is not now, nor likely ever will be, either directly in the hands of the general government or under its close control. The right of State authorities to require the attendance of all children at school was asserted early in the Colonies. Connecticut may claim to have been one of the first States in the world that established the principle. Its code of laws adopted in 1650 contained stringent provisions for compulsory attendance upon schools. In 1810, with the changed conditions resulting from immigration, it was found impossible to enforce the law without important additions, amounting in reality to a set of factory laws, forbidding the employment of children under fourteen years of age who have not attended school for at least three months in the year. As early as 1642, Massachusetts enjoined the selectmen of every town to see that all parents or guardians or masters taught their children, wards or apprentices so much learning as would enable them to read the English tongue and the capital laws, upon penalty of twenty shillings for each neglect thereof. A factory law similar to that of Connecticut was passed in 1834. Compulsory education must be accompanied by child labor laws to make it successful. All the States and Territories of the United States now have compulsory education in effect except the following: Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia. The percentages of illiteracy in these States are the greatest of any in the United States.

As has been seen, compulsory educational laws have not been adopted in any of the Southern States except Kentucky and Missouri. Three counties in Tennessee, through legislative enactment, have such laws, but no fair test has yet been given. In Asheville, North Carolina, by popular vote an ordinance was adopted requiring compulsory education. That State has a local option law for cities as to compulsory education. In the South,

great progress has been made in public education, especially during the past twenty years, despite the fact that this section remains, of all the Union, the only section where attendance on public schools between the ages of six and fourteen for a considerable period each year is not compulsory. But how necessary is an even greater effort to secure universal elementary education in the South is shown in the fact that in 1900, 27.9 per cent of all the illiterate white voters in the United States were in the South, while only 14.9 per cent of the white voters of the country were found here. In other words, we had nearly twice the illiterate population among the whites of voting age that our proportion of population justified. Of the total negro male population, 76.2 per cent lives in the South, and 85.5 per cent of the illiterate negroes of voting age live here.

I have no disposition to minimize the progress made in the South in reducing illiteracy. The record, in fact, is encouraging. In the South Atlantic Division the percentages were 46.2 in 1870, 40.3 in 1880, 30.9 in 1890, and 23.9 in 1900. In the South Central Division for the same years the percentages of illiteracy were 44.5 in 1870, 39.5 for 1880, 29.7 for 1890, 22.9 for 1900. The percentage for the United States was 20 for 1870 and 10.7 in 1900. For the North Atlantic Division it had decreased from 7.6 in 1870 to 5.9 in 1900. North Central 9.3 to 4.2, Western 15 to 6.3. In percentage of illiteracy the South, despite the reductions made, is still in point of literacy behind all the other sections of the Union, and far behind such countries of Europe as the German Empire, Switzerland, Scotland, Netherlands, England, France, Belgium, Ireland. Only Austria, Hungary, Greece, Italy, Portugal, Spain, Russia, Servia, and Roumania, of European countries, make a worse showing.

It is fair, of course, to exclude the negro population and consider only the white population, which in the South is almost entirely native born. It is conceded that the whites of the South constitute a pure branch of the Anglo-Saxon root. They trace their lineage directly to the early English, Scotch-Irish and German.

In 1870, the percentage of white illiterates ten years and over in the United States was 11.5; in 1880, 9.4; in 1890, 7.7; in 1900,

6.2. In 1870, the percentage in the South Atlantic States was 23.5; in 1880, 19.5; in 1890, 14.5; in 1900, 11.5. In 1870, the percentage in the South Central States, in which group Tennessee is included, was 23.4 per cent; in 1880, 21.6; in 1890, 15.3; and 1900, 11.8 per cent.

In Tennessee the percentage in 1870 was 26.9 per cent, or 3.5 more than the average for this division, and in 1900 the percentage was 14.1 or 2.3 per cent more than the average. In actual number of illiterates, we had of whites ten years of age and over 178,727, and in 1900, 159,086. *But of those of voting age the number had actually increased, 37,173 in 1870, 52,418 in 1900.* The total white males over ten years of age among the illiterates in this State is 77,275, females 81,811.

As to age periods, ten to fourteen years, the illiterate white males are 12,446; illiterate white females, 9,027; fifteen to twenty years, males, 12,411; females, 8,482; twenty-one years and over, males, 52,418; females, 64,302. "Mere Man" is evidently not in this generation appreciating the school advantages offered as formerly. The women are crowding the schools. The men will do the voting, but they are not equipping themselves for the elective franchise.

Of the native white population, only four States of the Union in 1900 had a larger illiteracy than our own, those being Alabama, Louisiana, North Carolina and New Mexico. While the native white population showed a percentage of 14.2 illiterates, the foreign white showed a percentage of 9.7.

As to the education of the negro, Tennessee ranked 34 out of 50 with a percentage of illiteracy in the colored population of 41.6. Several Southern States make an excellent showing as to the native white illiteracy. Oklahoma's percentage was only 2.5 per cent; Maryland, 4.1 per cent; Missouri, 4.8 per cent; Texas, 6.1 per cent; Mississippi, 8 per cent; Florida, 8.6 per cent. Eliminating the foreign population of Texas, there are only about 95,000 illiterates, or about $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

While not affecting the South materially, except in Louisiana and Texas — where the foreign population is considerable, and very illiterate — the general question of compulsory education, of course, involves the foreign immigrant and his children, and

this consideration has no doubt hastened the adoption of compulsory laws in the States of other sections.

The percentage of illiterates ten years and over among the foreign population in the United States in 1900 was 12.9. In the North Atlantic Division, it was 15.9; the South Atlantic Division, 12.9; the South Central, 22.8; the North Central Division, 9.4; and the Western Division, 8.5 per cent. The Eastern States with the largest percentage of illiterates among the foreign population were: Maine, 19.4; New Hampshire, 20.5; Vermont, 21.4; Massachusetts, 14.6. The largest numbers of illiterate foreigners in any States were in New York, with 258,423, and Pennsylvania, with 191,706. Our system of education is raising them up, as shown by the fact that the percentage of illiteracy among foreign born whites is 11.5, and among native whites of foreign parents, 2.

In cities of 25,000 and upward in the United States, the percentage of illiteracy among the voting population in 1900 was only 4.5 per cent. In the cities of the North Atlantic Division it was 5.8 per cent; in the South Atlantic Division, 3 per cent; in the South Central Division, 3.4 per cent; in the North Central Division, 3.3 per cent; and in the Western Division, 1.7 per cent. It will be seen that in this classification Southern cities make a good comparative showing. The percentage of white illiteracy in the voting population of Tennessee in the cities of 25,000 and over, including Memphis, Nashville, Knoxville and Chattanooga, was only 3 per cent. The percentage of negro illiterates under the same classification was 35.9 per cent. The cities of the East, especially of New England, have suffered in educational excellence by reason of the influx of foreign population.

The greatest illiteracy in cities outside the South is among foreign born whites. This, in 1900, in cities of over 25,000 for those of voting age was 9.8 per cent. The influence of the good educational systems of such cities is shown in the fact that the percentage of illiteracy for native whites of foreign parentage is about the same as for native whites of native parentage, and less than 2 per cent among those of voting age in such cities.

The percentage of illiteracy among the white males in the

North Atlantic Division in 1840 was 2.3 per cent only; in 1900, this had increased to 6.6 per cent. In 1840, the percentage among the white males of voting age in the South Atlantic States was 13.4 per cent, and in the South Central States, 12.7; these, by 1870, had increased to 15 and 15.4 per cent, respectively. They are now (1900), 11.5 and 11.6, respectively. That of the United States as a whole, is 5.9.

A more intensive examination of one State, and a community and section of that State, may illustrate what we have to deal with in the problem of ignorance.

Knox County, Tennessee, the writer's home, has an illiterate population among the native whites of voting age of about 14 per cent. The following East Tennessee counties, some of them adjoining Knox, have percentages of more than 20: Meigs, 20.8; Bledsoe, 21.1; Polk, 21.1; Campbell, 21.2; Marion, 21.5; Union, 21.6; Scott, 21.5; Anderson, 22.4; Morgan, 22.4; Sevier, 22.7; Monroe, 22.8; Hancock, 23.2; Grainger, 23.4; Unicoi, 24.2; Cocke, 24.6; Hawkins, 25.4; Claiborne, 25.6; Johnson, 26.9; Carter, 27.6. Twenty out of the thirty-three counties of East Tennessee have thus in the male whites able to vote over 20 per cent illiterate—an aggregate of 13,450. I have not the figures at hand, but if a county like Knox, with the best schools, has 14 per cent of such illiterate population, certainly the other thirteen counties would show averages from 14 to 20 per cent, and swell the aggregate of illiterate voters in this grand division of the State to over 20,000. Certainly the problem of education is not of distant lands.

Do not understand me to assert that this mass of illiterate voters is not in many ways educated. They are shrewd, observant people. They are industrious and thrifty. Their intelligence in many respects is large. Yet, unequipped with ability to read and write, deprived of the illumination of the written word, out of touch with the progress of the world, what a tremendous obstacle must they overcome in the struggle for life! Consider what the economic, political and social uplift of a State would be if this population were by reading able to improve itself. In 1906, a candidate for Governor of Tennessee on an illiteracy platform, and receiving the united

support of all the illiterates, would not have been the third man in the contest.

The fault in our school system seems to lie not only in the failure to secure the enrollment of the child, but more especially in the failure to secure his attendance after enrollment. Of the scholastic population in Tennessee, with which State the writer is more familiar, which in 1905 was 762,894, there were 507,000 enrolled, 537,000 including private schools, but the average attendance in public schools was only 348,000. When we remember that the average school year in Tennessee is only 116 days, and consider that less than half the school children are in school even half that short period during the year, we may appreciate why the condition is staggering. On its face the enrollment is creditable, but the irregular attendance and short terms of school make it impossible to cope with the mountain of ignorance, which to cut down needs heroic efforts.

If Germany, with less than one half of one per cent of population illiterate, requires a ten months' school course for all pupils from six to fourteen years of age, how will Tennessee ever reduce its illiteracy to the same degree with a 116-day course, and one-half the pupils in school? It has been asked, "If 242,498 children were not enrolled in the public schools in 1895, and 265,471 were not enrolled in the public schools in 1905, how long will it be until all who are eligible are enrolled?" and "If 382,293 were not in average attendance in 1895 and 424,206 were not in average daily attendance ten years later, and the per cent of such attendance is now 68.7, how long until the per cent of average daily attendance begins to show an increase?" And, it may also be asked "If there were more illiterate voters in 1900 than in 1870, when will there be none?"

The campaign for education in the South has accomplished much. Tennessee, for example, is spending nearly \$3,400,000 a year on its public schools. This is not quite \$5 per capita of scholastic population, but it is a considerable increase. Yet many States spend \$15 to \$20 per capita.

In general, it may be said that the school terms have been lengthened, the teachers paid better salaries, better buildings and equipment furnished. But does this suffice? Are not even

more heroic remedies needed for a condition manifestly so dangerous? At present there is an average of only thirty-six pupils in the schools to one teacher, in Tennessee. At least 50,000 more pupils could be instructed by the teaching force. It is argued that we must have more schoolhouses first. But we had no public schoolhouses before the public school system was established. Let the pupils trudge to school, and accommodations will be made for them.

The matter of the present bad attendance is shown in the reports for Knox County and Knoxville. The scholastic population of Knox County for the year 1905-06 was 28,204. Of this number, 10,682 belonged to the City of Knoxville, and 17,522 to the rural districts. The enrollment for the city was 5,833 and for the rural districts 12,225. It will thus be seen that the percentage of enrollment was 54.6 in the city, and 70 per cent outside the city. The average attendance of all the scholastic population was 43 per cent in the city and 42 per cent in the country districts. Those figures enable us to point to the sore spot. The schools in the city kept 179 days, and those in the country 157 days. The enrollment was good, but owing to lax interest of parents, only forty-three out of every hundred children of school age in the city attended, and less in the country.

To show how the attendance drops off year by year, take the Knoxville schools by grades. In the First grade there were 1,797 pupils; Second, 775; Third, 811; Fourth, 694; Fifth, 504; Sixth, 461; Seventh, 291; Eighth, 261; Ninth, 150; Tenth, 89. Look at the little army of nearly 1,800 diminishing to one-seventh its number before the high school is reached. How many reach the University? How many any technical school? Less than 5 per cent of our boys and girls acquire an education which we would consider average "common school." In Germany, or under any efficient compulsory educational system, the full course to the high school at least would be required.

I have been unable to secure statistics on the proportion of our population with a very meagre education, but these figures would indicate how little average schooling was being received. It is, of course, better for the child to secure even two or three years' rudimentary training than none at all, but certainly it is

a wrong for the State to allow the unworthy parent to permit the child to leave school with such a small equipment for life's battle.

How little, comparatively, we spend on education, despite our great advance of late, may be gathered from the fact that if the average teacher in Tennessee worked the average number of days at the average salary he would earn only \$158.40 a year, and yet we are ahead of several other States. Considering the remuneration, it is truly astonishing that so many devoted and painstaking teachers are obtained for the work, but of course on the average the instruction must be inefficient, and few men attracted to the work.

I am free to admit that while compulsory education is an ideal condition difficult to be realized, and that a further development of public sentiment in favor of universal education must precede it, just as every reform, moral, political or financial, must come as a result of general conviction; nevertheless, with the mass of ignorance to be coped with in the South, our efforts seem futile unless we arouse the States to such an extent that by a mighty effort, under a compulsory system, supported by the intelligent people of the South, the illiterate population not of an age beyond the reach of the schools is brought under instruction.

In some quarters, where there is a large negro population, the cost of compulsory education is urged as an objection. But it would seem that as the negro is to be here, he ought to have the right sort of training. It is probable that results up to this time have not repaid the amounts spent, but this is no doubt due to the nature of the education. The negro child, as does the white child, needs not only the technical instruction in letters, but more, he needs the discipline and character-forming influences of the schools. In my opinion, the greatest mistake ever made by the South was when it turned the instruction of the negro in churches and in schools over to his own race. The race is in the position of the man trying to raise himself by his own bootstraps. If by means of compulsory education the Southern white man could regain control of the instruction of the negro, the opportunity would be cheap at the price.

It is true the South could not fairly be expected to expend as

much as other sections on schools. Its per capita wealth is not nearly equal to that of other sections. The South's progress for the past twenty years has been exceedingly rapid, but even yet, in some regions of the South, the wealth is not as large as that previous to 1860. To understand the relative financial ability of the South as compared with other sections, the following will aid: In 1860, the average per capita taxable wealth of the United States was \$514. This had increased to \$1,314 in 1904. The per capita wealth of New England had increased from \$594 to \$1,498. Of the other North Atlantic States, from \$500 to \$1,763. The per capita of the South Atlantic States in 1860 was \$509. In 1904, it was \$716. The Southern South Atlantic States, however, consisting of North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia and Florida, had decreased from \$562 in 1860 to \$474 in 1904. In 1870, the per capita wealth in those States was only \$278. The South Central States had a per capita wealth in 1860 of \$598, and in 1904 of \$659. Tennessee's per capita wealth in 1860 was \$445, and in 1904, \$520. The Western Division now has a per capita wealth of \$2,228, and the Pacific of \$2,290; being the richest regions in the United States per capita.

The South, it must be remembered in considering these figures, has about one-third of its population negro, and if the per capita wealth of the whites alone were taken, it would make a somewhat better showing compared with other sections. In the problem of education, however, the children of all the population must be trained. The whites, with the bulk of the wealth, have submitted to taxation to pay for the education of white and black children. It is estimated that the whites have spent over three hundred million dollars for the common school education of the colored children, with little return from taxes on negro's property. The inability of the South as easily to spare as much money per capita for education as in the North is very apparent, but inasmuch as the need here is so much greater, therefore the question presents a different aspect here. *Should expenditures for education be based on proportionate wealth or on proportionate need?*

Indeed, these figures of per capita wealth, while they do offer

some excuse against heavy taxes for schools, also ought to suggest a more important deduction. Let us ask ourselves, If the South had had universal education since 1870, would not the great losses caused by the Civil War have been the sooner repaired, and would not our section, in the wealth of its people, now stand a better comparison with other sections? Those figures showed that in 1860, the per capita wealth of the South was about equal to that of other sections. An immense amount of property was destroyed during the Civil War in the South. In 1870, the per capita wealth was not quite half what it was in 1860. The percentage of illiteracy in that year was also very great. If the people of the South could have been gifted with prophecy as to the burdening effect of ignorance, it would no doubt since that time have spent twice as much, or more, for schools than they have done.

Since 1880 the effects of the loss during the Civil War have not been so evident in the South, and the progress of this section has been fast. But even during that period of two decades in actual increase of wealth we have not made as great advance as other sections. It is somewhat humiliating to examine the "graphics," displayed in the census reports showing the wealth of various States of the Union. How far behind are we may there be seen at a glance. The average capital of the Eastern States is at least ten times per State the capital invested in the Southern States.

Our Southern people have great pride of race and of history, and are strengthened thereby. Those are pardonable prides. They also, due to criticism, are sensitive. They do not like to look conditions in the face. They have not reached the point where they can with equanimity analyze their own conditions. Too small a proportion, owing to comparative poverty, have travelled in other sections. They do not realize our needs in an educational way. It is to be expected that the illiterate and ignorant have no conception of this need. But many who know better, also are indifferent. It is a lethargy which grows out of a long-continued condition, one that needs superhuman exertions to overcome. The task is great. But even though the South is still behind, the wealth is certainly sufficient for educational

needs. The value of property in Tennessee increased from \$498,000,000 in 1870 to \$1,400,000,000 in 1900. The day when any State of the South was unable to tax itself for schools for both races to accomodate all the scholastic population has passed. With a per capita wealth of \$620 Tennessee ought to spend more than \$1.50 per capita on its schools. In Germany the tremendous stimulus of general education has caused that country to forge ahead of other European nations, whose natural resources are greater than Germany's. To overcome the advantage of wealth which the North and West possess over the South, no policy would be complete without the institution of a more general, and more thorough system of education of the masses, as the first requisite. To secure such general instruction necessarily compulsion must be considered.

Argument is made that compulsory education is monarchical. It can hardly be called so, since it had its origin in this country. A second argument has been advanced against it that it enlarges the powers of government. Even if the American precedent could not be quoted, the right to compel attendance at school might, in a republic, be defended under the general head of self-protection, along with quarantine and hygienic regulations. It has also been urged that it interferes with the liberty of parents. No more than laws punishing the parent for the abuses of the child, or for depriving it of necessities which he is able to prepare for it. In compelling the parent to send the child to school, the State does no more than to secure to the child his right. Often the objection is heard that it deprives the parent of the labor of a child, and that in some cases the parent cannot afford this, or give the child decent clothes or pay for school books. This, in nearly all communities where compulsory education prevails, is looked after by the State. The community can much better afford to pay for clothing and books than let the child grow up in ignorance.

Strong pleas may be made for compulsory educational laws on the following grounds: The State taxes all classes for the support of the public schools, whether they have children to send or not. The State owes it to these taxpayers to see that the taxes collected shall be used for the purpose for which they are

levied. This is impossible unless it compels the attendance of all children at school. The taxpayer then, has a right to insist on a general law, on the ground that it is necessary in order to enable the State to perform its duty to him. But, it may as well be admitted, that something more than the passage of a compulsory educational law is necessary to secure general education. In several countries, and in some of our States, such laws have not proved more effective than voluntary education. Certainly it is essential that by a system of factory laws the opportunity of the child to attend schools must be made, and in addition there must be such a general desire for education and pride in its possession in the community as to induce a general acquiescence and co-operation in the enforcement of the law. In addition, the schools themselves must offer the best advantages. Prussia, the classic land of compulsion, provides in its school laws for an abundance of school-rooms, well equipped school-houses, and a high grade of teachers, and her compulsory system is successful. In Turkey, Greece, and Portugal, where these essentials and the education-loving population is lacking, the laws are not so successful. As a general statement, however, in the countries where compulsory education has been adopted and enforced, general education has been secured, illiteracy reduced and the stimulus to all sorts of educational work great. As we have seen, the progress of Germany has seemed to be due more largely to its elementary schools than any other one factor. In this country, New England first of all the sections provided for general education of its youth, and that region's wealth and influence on the country, considering its meagre resources and trying climate, has been attributed largely to this educational habit of its people.

Now, a word in conclusion: There are two very strong arguments for such a system which especially appeal to me. The first of these is on the higher ground that the State owes to the child an opportunity. It is a duty of altruism. Temperance legislation is, in a sense, an infringement on personal liberty, yet the movement spreads. First, because it is felt that the community has a right to protection against the nuisance and danger of the intemperate; and second, because the State ought to protect the

man with such inclinations against himself. If the intemperate man is dangerous, a breeder of poverty, vice and crime, so is the ignorant man. The State must be protected against the dragging down influence of the ignorant. Statistics show that the ignorant commit many more crimes in proportion to their numbers than the intelligent. Many more such are dependents. It is a burden on the State to prosecute crime and to maintain jails and almshouses. Their vice and idleness weaken the community in which they live. A parent who permits a child to grow up in ignorance is committing an offense not only against the child, but against the State.

Every consideration of the welfare of society, of good government, of the advancement of civilization, demands general elementary education, and as a corollary, more general higher education. But there will never be any material growth in educational progress until the root of the system is nourished.

With universal elementary education, the higher institutions will more largely flourish, and an intelligent society develop the technical needs which require schools of instruction in the multifarious industries and commercial interests, which form the economic life of an enlightened community. The economic value of education will appeal to some even more than the matter of duty to the child and to society. The wealth produced by a community composed largely of illiterate or barely literate people is manifestly small compared with that of the same number of well educated, and technically trained people. Experience has shown that, while some ignorant men win success, the mass sinks into the ranks of those who do not know from whence the next day's bread is coming. Countries with the highest average of education are certainly marked for the greatest progress to-day. Great as it is, our own growth in wealth does not nearly equal theirs. The economic progress of the South, the development of its splendid mineral and agricultural resources depends more than all else on general education of its people, and I do not exclude the negro population, though their education should be of a different character, as suited to a race which can for centuries do only the simpler labor of our section. Education must be not only such as to remove the stigma of

illiteracy, but it must be adapted to promote the greatest efficiency of each race. Only one acre of ten of cotton lands in the South is cultivated to produce a billion dollar crop. Not one hundredth proportion of our mineral lands is exploited. We do not manufacture anything like what we consume of manufactured goods.

I have cited the conditions. I have pride in what has been done, but I would not, out of pride, endeavor to deny that we need tenfold more zeal in application to the educational problem in order to break down the barrier of illiteracy and the ignorance which exists.

As I have said, I do not know that compulsory education is immediately practicable, but I firmly believe that it ought to be the end to which we shall work during the next few years, and when some Horace Mann or Thomas Jefferson arouses the people of our own and other Southern States to their duty, there need be no longer any doubt of the future of the South.

GEORGE F. MILTON.

Knoxville, Tennessee.

III. REFORM OF WAYWARD YOUTH *

There is apprehension that the excellent equipment of modern reformatories and industrial schools, such as electric lights, bath room, most improved methods of heating, free medical service, free dentistry, excellent teaching, lectures, entertainments, the best of food, many comforts the poor would call luxuries, solid buildings, elegant situation, fine scenery, superb cottages approximating to a refined country home—that the providing of these and many other advantages for the young who have gone

* A paper by the Honorary President of the Third European International Congress of Criminal Anthropology, and author of "Man and Abnormal Man;" including a study of children in connection with bills to establish laboratories under State and Federal governments in the study of the criminal, pauper and defective classes, with bibliographies. Senate Document No. 187, Fifty-eighth Congress, third session; 780 pages, 8vo. Washington, D. C. This document may be obtained through any United States Senator or Representative.

wrong, may take away that wholesome fear of jail or prison, which doubtless keeps many a youth from committing crime; that all such comforts should be provided by the State for its enemies, may make the idea of crime much less abhorrent and thereby tend to increase it among the young.

Let it be admitted that such treatment of wayward youth does sometimes lessen the wholesome fear of prison. It may be remarked that allowing the young to be arrested and remain in jail a few days will lessen such fear much more and have a damaging effect upon the youth forever after, if not preparing him for a criminal career.

But the State allows children born in unhealthy surroundings, to remain in them and until they break the law, they are not considered subjects for reform. The State should give the young a chance, and the industrial school and reformatory, with all their elaborate equipment, are for this purpose.

Every child has the right to a proper bringing up. If it have no parents or its parents cannot give it the rearing it has a right to, the community or State should do it. If its parents are unfit or unable or indifferent as to its welfare, the child is certainly not to blame and the State should see that it has a chance in the struggle for existence. Such a child at best will have enough disadvantage, when helped by the State, as compared with the child who has good parents. The fact that some parents would be encouraged to neglect their children if the State undertook to see that children are properly cared for, is no reason why the children should suffer. Parents who care so little for their children as practically to give them up, are parents whom the children might as well be without. That there are many children in any community who have improper homes is a fact too well known. Almost any policeman can tell you of parents with whom it is detrimental for the children to live. As those children are to be future citizens, it is incumbent upon the State to see that they have at least a chance to become good citizens.

The general modern principles and methods of reforming the young can be indicated in no better way than by giving the results and ideas of those who have had extensive experience in dealing at *first hand* with such problems. Some of the

truths here stated may seem very simple, but their importance is none the less on this account. The unanimity of opinion among those engaged in reformatory work is striking, when the diversity and complexity of youthful natures is considered. The writer has taken his material from the reports of some of the leading reformatories in the United States, often using the words of these reports. Naturally there is some repetition, especially as to the need of a good home, but this only emphasizes the great importance of parental care which the reformatory endeavors to supply to the unfortunate young.

The Industrial School is not a prison, nor is it a penal institution where erring boys are confined and cruel punishment meted out to them. People conceive this idea because it is connected with the courts. Neither is it a place of confinement where they put bad boys merely to keep them out of other people's way. The Industrial School is a charitable institution, educational in its general organization, for the mental, moral and physical training of that unfortunate class of wayward, misguided boys, who by the very nature of their environment, are either homeless, with no visible means of support, or have in some manner transgressed the laws.

It is not our aim to take issue with that class of theorists who insist because a boy, who, perhaps all his life, has been surrounded by bad associates, running wild in the streets with no restraining hand to retard his downward course; whose social conditions have not been the best, and who has in some manner infringed the law, is a criminal of the willful kind, and as such should receive the scathing ban of society's ostracism.

True it is, there are boys, and ever will be, who will not escape the penitentiary despite all the advice, precept and good training you may shower on them. This class, however, comprises a very small per cent of the whole, when we consider the large number of the decent, respectable, law-abiding young men who graduate from Industrial Schools and who have taken their place alongside the busy workers of the world — proving themselves good citizens, making an honest living and leading exemplary lives.

The so-called bad boy is not half so bad as his reputation.

The greatest fault with him is that he is misunderstood because he has been neglected; he has gradually developed from bad to worse until at last he is in the clutch of the law. Then it is he is given up for lost, and oftentimes thrown in jail with vile, vicious, unlawful men who delight to further aid his downward course.

Boys who are not criminals, but the victims of circumstances, who have broken the law between the ages of eight and sixteen, should never be placed in jail on a common basis with common prisoners. They should not be punished, but educated. Experience proves that they quickly respond to kind treatment and homelike influence. It is to this end the Industrial School was established.

In all respects the Industrial School aims to be a father and mother to the unfortunates, supplanting as near as possible the good home left behind; and improving on those that are not what they should be. To many, it is the best home they have ever known. It is so different from the street; so much nicer to be able to know where you are going to sleep — so many nice games, a large number of books, and a whole lot of boys to play with; all of whom seem to be doing the right thing.

The School aims to make it as easy as possible for the boy to do the right thing; and while we must confess all boys do not possess fine natures, yet we realize that aims are best attained, not by hard uncompromising lines of rigidity, or simply by excluding them from bad associates, but by good moral examples, patient study of the individual, constant regularity in habits of sleeping, eating, exercise, play, and a lively personal interest manifested among their teachers and officers in their sports, troubles, studies, etc.

Place confidence in the boy; give him justice; wake the smoldering ambition that is dormant in him; do not treat him as a sneak or inferior; teach him to look up, not down; direct his attention where he will find the best, purest and most noble things in life; encourage in him clean, manly sports; persuade him to do right for right's sake and not for the sake of policy; let him understand judgment is swift, sure and certain to him who disregards the law, and he who will not obey must be made to do

so. Teach him neatness, cleanliness and correctness. Give him to understand that he is to be educated, not punished, and that he will be received into the business world according to his ability to accomplish things. In fact, let him understand everything he undertakes should be done in the nicest possible manner and that it is absolutely necessary for him to do his best. Try to instill in his very being a love and respect for honest labor, patience, perseverance, consideration for other people's property and opinions; impressing on him the importance not to back down when he meets a reverse.

Methods of keeping the boys are simple. We work no methods of legerdemain to convert the self-willed boy of the street, who perhaps has been a menace to society, an enemy to himself, and a danger to the public in general, into a quiet, peaceful, even-tempered, smooth "Willy-Willy" boy with a strong desire to obey each rule to the letter and a burning passion to execute every command in a faultless manner. Boys, as a rule, are not made that way — it is not natural — and as a class they have not an over-amount of respect for watery sympathy — they want something more stable — it is facts and actions that count with them. They are quick to discern any movement that is for their welfare and are, if approached in the right manner, nearly always capable and willing to leave their past life behind and take up the task of character building.

Of course, boys sometimes run away, just as they leave some of the best, most congenial homes in the land to wander from door to door — veritable outcasts begging their daily bread; but the class who are placed on their honor, and then run away, are not the real representative body, and the chances are they will be ne'er-do-wells all their lives, though it must not be concluded because a boy runs away, we lose all hope in him, for oftentimes such turn out well.

We often receive boys who are from homes that were not the best, that were broken, unlawful, unnatural; their social connections all their lives have been the worst possible; they would have not the remotest idea of manners or refinement — almost wholly uncivilized — having known nothing but kicks and cuffs, and only been taught vice, dishonesty, and distrust of humanity

in general, and as a natural consequence regarded the law as an enemy. Their only church was the corner saloon, or the dark alley, where they spent their time smoking, gambling, or conspiring to confiscate other people's property to themselves, and as for the word "obey," they never knew its meaning. Yet some conservative people often ask us to reform this class of boys, who from almost infancy have never felt a firm, restraining hand, but have assayed to follow their own wills and proceed along lines that offered least resistance, often encouraged by those who should have been a shield and a guide to their young lives.

Again, we receive boys, whom some are pleased to term bad boys, from homes that are modest, congenial and lovely, whose parents are good, respectable, law-abiding citizens. Yet it is plainly true their boys do not always conduct themselves as they should. We might suggest in some cases parents do not understand their children; are not patient enough; or because of household duties or pressing business, there is a lack of parental attention, or years of over-indulgence have taught the boy he can do as he pleases and they nearly always please to do wrong.

Boys like people to take an interest in them, and they like to take an interest in things. They want to be noticed, encouraged, and if they cannot find their boyhood at home, the chances are they seek for it on the streets, and once they get the habit of loafing, the end is not far off. They are thirsty for sympathy, love good, clean companionship, and a lively interest taken in their boyish desires, games, etc., and this generally proves that the boy is all right.

It must be understood that the work is principally to build from the bottom up. It is necessarily slow, for we often encounter that class whose will has been their only law; they do not always readily take to the right way of thinking, neither do they always quickly respond to kind treatment; are often unappreciative, and unattentive to their duties; and while we are a strong advocate of moral suasion, we know with a certain class of boys, in fact all classes, if moral suasion fails and you do not use more strenuous means of correction, you certainly en-

courage them to travel further on the road to destruction and in the end they may be irretrievably lost.

In all institutions there is a beginning for every ward. He enters with all sorts of ideas concerning it. Some approach it in fear and trembling, some with complacency, some with gladness, and others with defiance or even arrogance; but observation teaches that all soon approximate a common level. They may lack education, refinement and moral training, but their perceptive faculties are unusually bright. A boy can tell at a glance what kind of a man he has to deal with, and his first impression is generally a right one. In consequence of this precocity, he is soon enabled to adjust matters to his own satisfaction concerning his surroundings. Or if an older boy, sullen, rebellious, looking for trouble, enters the institution, he finds himself in a quiet, busy and well-ordered community, each member of which seems to be behaving himself. One of his first experiences is introduction into the military organization where he gets physical exercise of a kind and quantity to dispose of all his superfluous energy; and, as a rule, he speedily comes to realize that he is a very small part of a very large machine, and that it requires a bold man, when a thousand others are marching a certain way, to attempt to go in a different direction. This gets him into a proper frame of mind for undertaking his other work, and in most cases, after a few attempts at independence, he submits to go along with the current, and there is no trouble whatever with him from a disciplinary point of view.

All children are not alike bad, therefore all do not need the same restraining influences. Some only need the timely caution, some the stern rebuke, while others will never know your meaning or appreciate their own situation, until you apply the most severe punishment. These are all necessary appliances in child-training, but care should be exercised in their administration. The line must be drawn on the side of leniency, and justice must balance the scales, or you will antagonize. In no case ought a child be corrected in the heat of impatience or the flush of anger, but in all well-governed schools there should be a proper time for the rendering of accounts, and then only to such persons as are capable — a man with a mother's heart and sym-

pathies, combined with an offended father's dignity, one who can act coolly and quietly and appreciate the fact that what is done in haste is usually repented at leisure.

Education does not make the man; it adorns him, and should bring all his faculties into their fullest use. It is development, and is surpassed in grandeur only by manliness. A man may be an educated nobody. He is, in his proper sphere, a triple combination made up of moral, intellectual and animal capacities. Where he is lacking in any of these, cultivation becomes a necessity, and education resolves itself into a complex machine; accelerating and retarding are the bases of its operations. It is a mistake to educate the head at the expense of the heart and hand. The teachings of the school, the workshop, the garden, the farm, and the heart attuned to all that is good, noble and true, is education. These distinctions ought to be brought before the child in simplicity, and when he is in a condition to receive them. "An occasional dropping is better than a rainy day for a tender plant."

The children should be taught that the smiles of Nature are not constant; that they must accept of sunshine and shower, dark days and weary nights; that the friends of to-day may become the enemies of tomorrow; and that they must be ever prepared to meet adversity on the moral plane.

Diversion is the magical wand, the teacher's panacea and the boy's scapegoat. Those who have labored with children will agree that there are times when everything seems to go wrong with them. We may coax, and we may punish, and all to no effect; an incompetent teacher is in a dilemma, but one with tact will observe readily that the children are nervous from application or some other cause, and will immediately employ a little diversion. After a good laugh, the telling of a story, or the singing of a song, all will at once settle down to work, perfectly satisfied, and never know how the change came about.

To play is the delight of every boy, to a greater or less extent; certain limits, however, should govern them, even in amusement. All should be considered, whether in school, at work or at play, with the same spirit; no cheating, no false representations, no subterfuge should be tolerated. It is just as

necessary to use vigilance and discretion during their pastime as when otherwise engaged.

All children should be considered capable of learning. What they have not naturally they can obtain mechanically, but all are not alike adepts in any pursuit. It is questionable whether a child knows what he can do best, therefore persons managing children ought to be good judges of human nature, and thus be enabled to solve the problem of life in its active sphere of labor for them. All should learn some handicraft whereby to support themselves, and those who may be hereafter dependent upon them. Should a boy exhibit traits of character pointing toward any of the professions, or any particular line of business, it is no burden to carry with him the knowledge of a good, substantial trade, for, should everything else fail, he will turn to it as his capital in store, and by it raise himself with dignity and independence.

The library is essential, and the more it is used the less trouble we shall find in the performance of our arduous duties. Some children will devour the contents of a book in such a manner that it does them but little good. We desire that they will take time for thought and digestion of the matter and subject. Others do not have a desire to read at all, consequently we must read for them. Children's books should be children's reading; each stage in life has its tastes in literature, and we must not expect to put "an old head on young shoulders." Reading matter of a trashy nature should always be excluded from the young, especially the blood-and-thunder dime novel.

Music is an incentive, and breathes the spirit of a better life. It is elevating and conducive of great power over the affections of the heart. Children love to sing, and the good old songs and hymns learned in childhood will follow to old age. In one reformatory the band plays six times a day when the boys march to and from their meals. The refining influence of music is here utilized.

All children are liable to error, but there should be proper discrimination between moral and conventional wrong-doing. Our manner of disposing of such matters is to keep a record of every important wrong a child may from day to day commit. This

report is submitted by the officers and teachers of the school to the superintendent, in writing, without exaggeration or diminution, at which time he holds a moral review, calling up each child separately to make answer to the charges preferred against him. This is a time for care and forethought, for earnest consideration, and the full exercise of all the knowledge at our command. There must be no haste, no harshness, and while we should be lenient, yet the wrong must not be forgotten. This is the time to make impressions, pointing the child to the consequences for the present and for future manhood.

We do not desire to hold a child longer than is necessary for his good. As soon as he becomes established in well-doing and has sufficient education to enable him to transact business, he should return to his home, or some home. Should he not prove strong enough to do well among his old associates, the parents or guardians have the right to send him back to the school, where he must make another start. This is a wise provision, and holds a restraint over the boy, even in our absence, until he becomes a man. In the case of a child who has no home, we are to him father, mother and friend, whether he is with us or not.

Often born in poverty, amid dissolute surroundings, the child first sees the light where dirt and squalor reign; he grows up amid these surroundings; his playground is the street or alley, or worse; his companions are those who are equally unfortunate; he has but little if any home life, the parents concerned only in the struggle for existence and frequently engaged in vicious employment, are not able to give him more than an occasional thought, and when they do, it is rather to serve their own selfish purposes than to benefit the child. Just as soon as he is large enough he is put to work to earn something to help the family, and now he comes in contact with an older, and usually a rougher class than himself. The chances are that he has not been permitted to attend school, or if so, has played the truant, and so has neither the training nor education with which to begin life on arriving at the period of adolescence. At this time in life he frequently runs away, or is obliged to leave home and shift for himself; and left largely to his own devices, with ill-defined ideas of right and wrong, with but little if any educational advantages, and

but little or no moral or religious training, he finds it difficult to obtain the means of living, soon violates the law, and thus naturally gravitates to the industrial school, reformatory or prison.

Enforced regular habits, and systematic physical exercise enable almost every inmate to leave the school sounder and stronger than when he entered. Long continued military drill makes order, neatness and respect for law and authority, habitual. It may be said that these things affect only the physical and mental sides of nature, and what children need is moral improvement. It is true that at the start the average boy earnestly applies himself to these things without any love for them, and for the reason that he is told that only by making a certain record of proficiency in them can he be released, but in the doing, there comes in time a development of that indescribable something which we call character, and everything is now looked upon from a different and better point of view. He then acquires the power of persistent and concentrated effort, changes his aims and ambitions, and becomes receptive to the more direct moral influence of the school. Through these and similar instrumentalities the object of the institution — reformation — is accomplished with reference to the majority of the inmates.

Military drill develops the attention as well as the muscles. Perfunctory movements cannot be tolerated. In the manual of arms one is required not only to perform a certain muscular act, but to do it at the same time, and conform exactly in final position with from sixty to six hundred others. The hesitation of one cadet would result in delay and inconvenience to all. Disobedience in rank, therefore, becomes unpopular, and the habit of obedience is formed and strengthened by the daily and hourly repetition suggested by the very word "drill." The drill is planned not so much to perfect the cadets in exhibition movements as to develop in them the qualities which mark good soldiers in active service: obedience, order, and faithfulness in the performance of duty.

A great many citizens do not seem to appreciate how much good, wholesome home training does for a boy in the way of keeping him out of trouble while he is passing through those

years from ten to eighteen; when he is neither child nor man, is easily impressed, quick to follow the leader, to be good or bad; and if for any reason his home life does not restrain or entertain him he is quite apt to drift and get into trouble, though he may be at heart the kind of a boy who would make a good man under favorable conditions.

It is an easy step for a boy, who does not have just the right environment, to get into the habit of running away from school; and unless there is an interest taken by the parents and an understanding between teacher and parent as to just what the pupil needs in the way of encouragement to help him over the hard places, he is apt to follow the course that offers the least resistance, and takes up the habits of the gamin and the tough whom he meets on the street. There is a tendency on the part of every boy during these years, when character is being formed, to imitate or follow the boy who dares to do things out of the ordinary, from throwing paper wads in school to smoking cigarettes in the basement; a sort of hero-worship of the wrong type, and unless strong lines are thrown out he is apt to lose his bearing and become a law breaker. His offense may be anything from running away from school to stealing junk, robbery, or in fact, anything in the whole category of crime. He has taken on many bad habits in his journey so far; has in many instances little respect for law or order, has not a clear idea of property rights, has not been taught that he is only entitled to those things that he has earned or acquired honestly, and has no conscientious scruples about taking what does not belong to him. This does not apply to all boys. A good many have had good home training, but in some instances are victims of broken families or intemperance, and, for one reason or another, are off the track.

Turning a willful, wayward boy, often more sinned against than sinning, from his evil courses and making a useful, law-abiding, tax-paying citizen of him, is, leaving the humanity of it entirely out of consideration, the wisest sort of business economy measured by dollars and cents. To take friendless boys, secure positions for them and make them *permanently* self-supporting and self-respecting (on the basis of 209 boys) has cost,

per capita, \$75.21. Of this cost the boy himself contributes *one-third*. This is what a certain institution adds as a note:

"The Reform School does not, nor does it claim to, reform all the boys who come into its keeping. Good parents, with whom no institution, however wisely managed, can compare, do not always succeed in raising to manhood sons who do them honor. Boys go astray in the world in many ways and for many causes. Some have no parents and run at large, subject to numberless temptations. Others have parents whose precepts and examples harm instead of help them. In the cases of others the parents have not the time nor the means, perhaps lack of inclination, to give them that constant supervision they require. They cease to go to school. Idleness takes the place of industry. Desire outrunning their means of gratifying them, they take what they are too idle to earn and lack the self-restraint to deny themselves. Very soon such boys, exempt from the wholesome restraint of watchful discipline, become curses to themselves and to their communities."

Upon the arrival of such a boy at the reformatory the daily routine of his life is changed. He is under strict discipline all the time. He is well fed and well clothed, has a comfortable place to sleep in, has his hours of recreation, and his nurses when he is sick. But he must go to school. He must work a portion of each day at some useful occupation, during the course of which he will learn one or more trades by which he may earn his living after he leaves the school. He is in a school, the rules of which are more numerous and exact than the laws of the State. His breaking of these rules is surer of detection and is followed by penalties swifter and more certain than imposed for the breaking of the laws of the State. His privileges in the school and his release from it on his "honor," depend upon his cheerful yielding to wholesome discipline, upon his industry in the school or at whatever work to which he has been assigned, upon his treatment of his associates and obedience to those in authority over him, upon his truthfulness and trustworthiness, his honesty and manly qualities generally. When he has thoroughly reformed and yields to the rules that obedience, for lack of which to the laws of the State he was sent to the school, he is

prepared to return to his home, if he has one, and it is a proper one, or a proper one can be procured for him.

The training that must be relied upon to bring about the change in character does not differ from the training that develops character and ability in the case of the normal individual. No industrial school or reformatory possesses copyright methods of moral training. It endeavors only to supply those things that the boy has failed to receive in his earlier training. Among the very common neglects of his early life is that of school attendance. To make up for this, the boy is placed in school.

Many agencies are operating to drag children down. Homes broken by death, divorce, and desertion; parents utterly unfit for parenthood; stepfathers and stepmothers who have no love for their unfortunate stepchildren; evil companionship, poverty and other forces are busily recruiting ranks of the delinquent class who must be cared for in this school. The one great universal defect is *moral weakness*. There is some mental, some physical delinquency, but every boy sent us is weak morally. He has little or no conscience. A man without a moral conscience is a bad citizen. The delinquent boy was never trained to feel the sinfulness of wrong-doing. His only concern is not to get caught. He fully agrees with the boy who said: "A lie is a very present help in time of trouble." With their disposition to profanity, untruthfulness, and larceny, inherited from several generations, we have a stupendous task set us so to teach, train, influence, direct, and reform them in the short space of time that they may go forth and develop into good men. We can report seventy-five per cent doing well — some better than others—but so many at least are making a manly effort to keep their parole agreements. Some of these will probably lapse, and others not doing well will probably improve. Most of the boys going out really want to live a better life. They promise to keep out of evil ways, and are honest in their promises, but many are too weak morally to stand out against the temptations of life. The social side of the boy's life is carefully looked after. This is done not only with a view of keeping his interest alive, but of making him overcome any diffidence he may have about meeting people. When the boy feels that he can do something he is

more encouraged to mingle among people, and is thus able to gain friendship for himself.

Boys are born with certain physical characteristics. These characteristics persist with the utmost tenacity. It is equally true that boys are born with certain intellectual aptitudes. These likewise are persistent, but capable of improvement; yet it is true that the lack of certain mental activities may never be overcome, however skilled the training. As it is with the physical and the intellectual, so it is with the moral. The lack of certain moral sensibilities is as inherent, fundamental and persistent as either physical or mental characteristics. As the moral qualities are more elusive, so the change through moral training becomes more difficult and the results less apparent. This, however, is the problem of the industrial school or reformatory. Into this institution are placed the most hopeless cases to be found in the population of the State; those that society, the Church, the schools and the courts have failed to save. The industrial school must do what all these forces have failed to do or it has done nothing. The terrific force of inherited tendency to crime, the blighting influence of vicious homes and vicious companions, must all be met and conquered by the training and education of the industrial school. Every boy that is received within its doors is the resultant of the two great forces of heredity and environment. If the former predominates, the task of reclaiming, though not a hopeless one, is one of extreme difficulty — in fact, is not certain of having been accomplished so long as healthy activity remains — for relapses may occur under great temptation, even after years of successful resistance.

The increasing extent of juvenile depravity is one of the startling facts that the published data of modern investigation reveal. The vicious, criminal and immoral lives led by some boys emphasize the fact that familiarity with crime and association with criminals make the street, rather than the home and school and church, the teacher of youth. The influence of vicious and improvident homes, where boys of tender years are allowed to come in contact with crime in its most revolting aspect, is an important factor in placing the responsibility for a large portion of juvenile delinquency where it belongs. The law cannot be de-

pended upon to regulate these things. With a strange persistency it continues to deal with the offense instead of the offender, although it is for the good of the latter that the laws are made.

It is morally certain that a boy or man who can or will not earn his release or parole from reformatory institutions by obedience to their just and easy rules, when he is exempt from the perplexities and uncertainties and inequalities and injustices of the world, will not obey those laws which the world at large establishes as its rule for its security. Since the boy's reform is only partially effected when paroled, and since the one and only purpose of schools is to accomplish the boy's reform, it is easy to appreciate the importance of careful and faithful supervision of the boy while on parole. As much depends on the kind of a home he is to have, it is necessary to make an investigation of the home. Statistics show that the great majority of our boys come from poor homes — homes of poverty and moral neglect; homes where death, divorce and desertion have robbed the children of everything that is supposed to make home sweet. About thirty per cent of the boys are entirely homeless, while many others would be better off were they homeless also. In respect to the home, there are three classes of boys: First, those who have fairly good homes; second, those who have no homes; third, those who have wretched homes. The problem is to deal with the latter. Boys who have good homes can return there. Boys who have no homes can be homed with good people; but those of the wretched homes clamor to go back, and the misguided parent pleads to have them, while to send them back is but to have them returned in a short time.

The critical time is when the inmate leaves the institution to begin life in the world. Boys over fifteen, with new cravings and development of social interests, are much less likely to be contented with farm life than younger children. It is necessary to follow up, advise, assist and restrain boys on parole. With none to advise and encourage them, they may become discouraged and fall.

Some boys on leaving are lost track of at once. Some of these are the best, some are the worst. They may be ashamed to have it known that they were ever in the custody of the courts, and

would rather have their name changed than to have it known that they were ever in a reform school. But the great majority are willing to have the truth known. In many schools it is claimed that seventy per cent are reformed and thirty per cent go down. Thirty per cent is a small number, when it is remembered that there are charges against everyone sent to an institution.

There is a feeling among those in charge of reformatories that some of the inmates are released too soon; although their time is up, they have not been moulded sufficiently to withstand temptation. The superintendent of a reformatory should be allowed to decide such cases. No person, no matter at what age, should be allowed freedom, unless there be reasonable probability that he will not be dangerous to life, property or public peace.

Every inmate leaving a reformatory should be made to feel and understand that he has left a home, to which he can always return, should temptation prove too much for him in life's struggle. Some boys sent to the school reach the age when they must be released under the law, before the work of reformation sought to be secured, and greatly to be desired, has been accomplished in their cases. Any boy committed to the reform school, who has not attained his "honor" should not be released, but be sent to the reformatory on an indeterminate sentence to remain there until, under the rules of that institution, he has earned by his good conduct his release, or having proven by his bad conduct that he is irreclaimable, be sent to prison.

The Industrial School for Girls is not a house of correction, but is designed as a refuge for girls between the ages of six and twenty-one years, who, by force of circumstances or associations, are in manifest danger of becoming outcasts of society. It is not a place of punishment to which its inmates are sent as criminals — but a home for the friendless, neglected and vagrant children, where, under the genial influences of kind treatment and physical and moral training, they may be won back to ways of virtue and respectability, and fitted for positions of honorable self-support and lives of usefulness.

Girls committed to the school become wards of the State.

By the act of commitment, fathers and mothers lose their parental rights and responsibilities; and the board of trustees, with the principal matrons, assistant matrons and teachers, in behalf of the State, become as parents to the children. In one institution there has been received one thousand and thirty girls, all coming under the head of delinquents, and of all colors, conditions and nationalities.

Many of the girls were not naturally vicious, but have either been led into wrong-doing by those older and of stronger mind, or have been forced into it by home conditions. The homes that most of our girls come from, and the kind of parents they have, could not well bring about other results. Sometimes it is the ignorance of parents, sometimes the avarice, and often the viciousness brought about by drunkenness, which is the potent factor.

Girls respond, physically, mentally and morally, to the orderly life of the school. As they are at an impressionable age and free from distraction, they are easily led to accept their duties in the industrial and book schools. This work becomes a pleasurable outlet for their energies. To many of them on arrival cleanliness is a stranger, and it is not easy to reconcile them to the rules in this respect. In the matter of classification, about one in ten passes to the lowest grade, and only a half dozen of these are persistently recalcitrant. Upon the whole, they are more amenable to the lighter forms of discipline than older girls. Although the impulse to run away overcomes them more readily than older girls, it is, nevertheless, true that they hold less fixedly in mind the idea of getting their freedom and show a contentedness with their daily life after the period of quarantine is over. The habits of the younger girls are not so fixed as in older girls. They are more amenable to lighter forms of discipline than older girls; more curious, hence more easily interested and pleased; they talk less of getting their freedom; they are more active and less ready to settle down to steady habits of work; they are all backward in school; they are able to concentrate attention for only a short period of time; few know how to dust, sweep, wash, cook or sew; they must be taught the common decencies of life.

The aim is to develop healthy bodily and mental activities. There is little of repression. The effort is to hold in check, and if possible to eliminate, vicious tendencies by fostering a healthy development of the physical and mental and moral life. The means to this end may be described under the following three divisions:

(a) *Physical Culture*—A careful examination of each girl is made by a competent physician soon after her arrival. Calisthenics and gymnastic exercises suited to her years and bodily conditions are prescribed by the instructor in physical culture, and practised in a well-equipped gymnasium.

(b) *Educational Work*—The object of the educational work is to arouse interest and to develop skill in all that pertains to the management of an ordinary household, and to give to all the best common school education.

(c) *Moral Instruction*—The moral instruction is enforced by practice and example rather than by precept. The officers and teachers are all selected with reference to their personal qualifications and influence upon the girls of the every-day life of the institution. Girls upon admission are kept apart from the other inmates until their characters and habits are ascertained, and are then placed in one cottage or another, according to their characteristics. Corporal punishment is prohibited. For disciplinary purposes, resort is had to withdrawal of some privilege or opportunity which would be prized. In the rare instances in which anything further is required, there is seclusion in well-lighted isolated rooms under medical observation, with light but nutritious diet and regular outdoor exercise.

There is hope for the girl with an uncontrolled temper, habits of petty thieving and sexual weakness. Such a girl will have upsets, but she needs someone to sympathize with her and guide her. She is not troubled with inertia. The typical profligate is contented and soft. Some girls, like their parents, are so crude and ignorant and have so low a standard of life, that if they can be made morally decent and able to earn a living, little more can be expected.

When institution girls are sent out, they feel more responsible to strangers than to their parents or relatives at home; they are often sent to strangers first before being returned to the freedom of their own home, where they may not feel obliged to do their best.

It is the belief of many that a girl should be in an institution for at least three years, but that she should be given repeated trials. For long seclusion does not fit her for the outside world, correction cannot be consummated in an institution where the life is necessarily one of rule and routine, and where personal responsibility is very limited.

ARTHUR MACDONALD.

Washington, D. C.

SHAKESPEARE IN RECENT YEARS

I. HIS RELATION TO HIS PREDECESSORS¹

With the revival of interest in a more distinctively literary study on a sound basis in our colleges and universities throughout the western world—a study necessarily profoundly affected by the broad principles now underlying the pursuits of philology, history, philosophy and science—it has been inevitable that Shakespeare, the chief dramatic interpreter of the thoughts and emotions of this western world, should become the subject of renewed inquiry and discussion. Indeed, so great has been this output that it is with some temerity that one even announces a paper on Shakespeare. I shall merely plead as *my* excuse a genuine interest in the subject born of a study existing and increasing now consciously through twenty years; and similarly, I believe I may count on a degree of intimacy and interest in others. Paradoxical or not, this very familiarity contributes a chief reason for writing on these matters.

But if Shakespeare has become more and more a subject of academic study, he is becoming less and less a tradition for the English and American stage and playworld. Mr. Sidney Lee's latest book on "Shakespeare and the Modern Stage" would imply that it is requiring serious effort in Great Britain to restore Shakespeare to what Mr. Lee considers his theoretically deserved place in popular esteem and to win general practical acceptance for the recognition of the poet's educational value. We hear from many sides, as from Mr. Bernard Shaw and the Russian novelist, Tolstoy, that Shakespeare is entirely overrated. A stay in New York for several weeks at the height of the theatrical season usually displays the fact that no Shakespearean play at all is regularly before the public in that city. Two houses of grand opera in full blast—in the belief that New York can support what no other city on earth attempts—musical concerts without number, unlimited vaudeville, but in genuine theatrical

¹ The material for this and the paper to follow was used in lectures before the Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, in January, 1907.

work only a sprinkling of nondescript representations, seem to be what the American public, judged by the New York standard, is demanding, or is at least paying for. The Ben Greet Company well nigh alone may be excepted. This company has been travelling among our universities and smaller cities in the South and West, presenting the morality of "Everyman" and sundry plays of Shakespeare with a simplicity and a naturalness suggestive of the Elizabethan spirit.

Every age and generation has its own way of looking at things: demands its new and personal interpretation of a philosophy of literature and of life. Like the continued recurrence of spring-time and youth, the mystery is ever new and never ceases to surprise. Each one must interpret a piece of literature in his own modes of thought, must experience its enjoyment and derive its lessons for himself. The really great masters in literature — and they are necessarily very few — are great just in that they divined and expressed life in such large measure as to give something, and never the same thing, to each age and generation, to every student of literature anywhere.

Three such names the ancient Greeks undoubtedly furnished: Homer, if we may still unite under one name the racial genius that produced the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*; Æschylus, the author of the *Agamemnon* trilogy and the *Prometheus*; and Sophocles, the portrayer of *Œdipus's* agony and *Antigone's* calm despair. Our modern age — and this is the glory of our Mother Country and the British race — furnished certainly one, and perhaps but one: the creator of *Romeo and Juliet* and *Mercutio*; of *Shylock* and *Portia*; of *Richard III* and *Henry V*; of *Bully Bottom* and *Falstaff* and *Dogberry* and *Touchstone* and the *Fool* in "*Lear*;" of *Beatrice* and *Rosalind* and *Viola*; of *Brutus*, of *Hamlet*, and *Othello*, and *Iago*, of *Lear* and *Edmund*, of *Macbeth* and *Lady Macbeth*, of *Antony* and *Cleopatra*, of *Ophelia*, *Desdemona*, and the *Lady Cordelia*, of *Imogen*, of *Prospero* — but where shall we end? The *Prospero-Shakespeare* has minted so many fresh coins from his brain to be current among mankind!

I have used advisedly the term "creator." For this act approaches most nearly that of divinity itself. He made man in His own image: He created the living soul. We do not speak of

Falstaff, Hamlet, Iago, Cleopatra, as types, generic of a class. We mean Falstaff, Hamlet, Iago, Cleopatra themselves, portrayed in all their complexity. Your lesser writers, even of as great magnitude as Charles Dickens, deal in types. But Divinity creates the individual, and can go no farther.

From this point of view in our English literature, perhaps Chaucer alone approaches most nearly to the first great class of poets, makers or creators. The tragedy of "Troilus and Criseyde" stirred with profound pity through its story of unhappy love two hundred years before "Romeo and Juliet." For I still must adhere rather to Professor Price's delicate interpretation printed ten years ago in the Publications of the Modern Language Association, than accept the attempt of Professor Cook, of Yale, at a recent meeting of this Association, at an extreme modification of this view, where Chaucer's Criseyde was reduced to a mere wanton. It seems to me that this latter conception leaves out the very thing in dispute — the literary quality — the delicacy of insight, the interpretative power of a master-poet. I think we may accept, too, that the dramatic genius that created the Wife of Bath was not only of a high order, but not far below that which produced Falstaff himself.

In other literatures, whom shall we name? Some deny this first great position to Dante, the chief poet of mediævalism, as too subjective and egoistic despite all his populating of Hell, Purgatory, and Paradise. Many likewise deny the first of all positions to Milton, the creator of Satan; although a very good friend of mine, and a great lover of poetry, places him at the head of all English poetry. The answer depends not a little on our conception of what poetry is or should be, and the place of the *made epic* in its relation to the *drama* in literary art.

The lyric singers with their outbursts of the glorified Me are in still another class — except in the Hebrew Psalter, where the worship of Jehovah lifts the speaker and singer far beyond himself into the heights of a glorified ecstasy.

Shall we include Molière, who has best expressed the racial genius of the French people? Shall we then name the German Goethe, who a hundred years before anticipated so much of the critical and scientific intellectual habit of the nineteenth and

twentieth centuries? Shall we name the lone figure of Don Quixote in Spanish literature, the contemporary of Falstaff, lingering between the eve of mediævalism and the dawn of modernity, which laughed Spain's chivalry away? Diverse answers may come from different sources.

The great difference in the present approach to Shakespeare from that of former days is the contributory light which is thrown upon him. The poet is studied not only for and in himself, but in the light of his predecessors and contemporaries, and these in view of a world movement. This does not mean any the less intimate study of the poet's work in and for itself; but a wider knowledge, a greater intelligence, and larger sympathies have become associated with that closer study. We wonder no less at the intellectual power and poetic imagination which produced the work; but we are able to trace better the normal processes by which that genius developed. Shakespeare becomes removed from the position of a fetich, and is chiefly the constructive artist working in a dramatic medium.

We do not expect to find a great mountain peak rising isolated out of a low-lying plain, but approached by a broken and undulating country. Shakespeare had his predecessors like Lyly, Greene, Peele, Kyd, Marlowe; contemporaries like Ben Jonson, Beaumont and Fletcher, Chapman, Middleton, Heywood and Dekker; followers like Massinger and Webster. The Elizabethan age was one of intense poetic and dramatic activity. Coming after the physical and mental unrest of the reigns of Henry VIII and Mary, it was one of rich, full, pulsating life. This corresponding movement in literature found its best expression in dramatic form. Everybody seemed to be a dramatist, as in our degenerate days everybody has written fiction. And Shakespeare was the highest fulfillment of this best expression of the life and thought of his day. Or to state it differently in a sentence somewhat adapted: The greatest glory of England is her literature, and the greatest glory of her literature is its poetry, and the greatest glory of her poetry is its dramatic rather than its epic and lyric triumphs; and the greatest dramatist — among this set of remarkable men who have been too far unknown to the general reader — is Shakespeare.

But let us leave externals and come to a discussion of the plays themselves. We know well that Shakespeare did not invent new forms, any more than he usually invented his plots. He merely transcended other men's work by the power, glow, and vigor of his imagination. Before Shakespeare there were comedies like Lyly's, stilted and affected though they were; there were Chronicle or History Plays like Peele's "Edward I," Greene's "James IV," Marlowe's "Edward II," and the anonymous "Edward III;" Romantic Plays, again like Greene's "James IV;" examples of bombast like Peele's "Battle of Alcazar," Greene's "Alphonsus of Arragon" and Marlowe's "Tamburlaine;" Tragedies of Blood like Kyd's "Spanish Tragedy" and Marlowe's "Jew of Malta." Before Shakespeare wrote "Venus and Adonis" and "Lucrece" there were narrative poems like those of Spenser, Lodge's "Glaucus and Scilla," Daniel's "Complaint of Rosamond," and Marlowe's "Hero and Leander." Before Shakespeare's essays in the Sonnet, there had been not only Wyatt and Surrey, who introduced the form to English literature, but Sidney's "Astrophel and Stella," long the model for a sonnet sequence on unhappy love, with its countless imitators.

It is well, too, to remember the tremendous influence of the Continental literatures on the Elizabethan, for it is only by degrees that we have come to realize the importance of their study as bearing on this subject. In an age of travel accompanying the Revival of Letters and the Renaissance, England knew French and Italian literatures fairly well, and not a little of the more remote Spanish and German. Latin — however carelessly learned and used — was still the universal tongue of the school and of all education; and Greek had begun to exert its influence on the universities. Most of these influences met in greater or less degree, directly or indirectly, in Shakespeare, as the creature of his age. So vividly Italian does the dramatist seem at times that some think he must have visited Italy — the Northern Italy of Lombardy and Venetia, of Milan and Verona and Mantua and Padua and Venice. He does not describe so closely the Italy further South — Tuscany, Rome, and the Two Sicilies. The French conversations in "Henry V," and French phrases and sentences scattered through the plays, make it probable that

their author knew a sort of Anglo-French, picked up in the streets and taverns of London which still held close relations with the neighboring French coast. He did not know German. I recall now only one German expression in the plays: "*Lustique*, as the Dutchman says," in "*All's Well*," II, iii, 37.

He must have known of Lyly's Latin Accidence which he ridiculed in the "*Merry Wives*," and have read some of the stories of Ovid and picturesque portions of Vergil — tale-tellers who were favorites during the Middle Age and far into the period of the Renaissance. Perhaps, too, he was acquainted somewhat with Livy, the popular Latin historian, and naturally had read a play or two of Plautus and of Seneca, in a day of classical imitative impulse. A Stratford Grammar School-boy would at least know something of Latin, if he knew anything. There were then no courses to divert his attention like our present day English, History, and Higher Mathematics in American preparatory schools, the examinations in which, for entrance to college, I am sure Shakespeare could not have passed.

We can now better understand how Shakespeare entered upon his career of dramatist. Becoming connected somehow with the theatre, he practised his 'prentice hand in working over old plays. He doubtless at first attempted no more than to make a play go better and be more actable — attract a bigger public, and bring more silver into the receipt-box. He must have turned instinctively to scenes which contained dramatic possibilities and have developed those, perhaps leaving many portions of the old play as it was. At length, while still making use of older material, whether in a crude play already existing or in a story-book, he seized upon the dramatic possibilities of a situation and of a character, and wrote the play from start to finish. Yet, never did the dramatist give up his early habit of helping out an old play and making it more probable by touching up certain scenes or rewriting them entirely afresh, leaving the rest of the play to some colleague. It was a method perhaps inseparable from the theatrical exigencies of the day. This seems the best way to explain at later and very different stages of his work the inequalities and deficiencies in such a variety of plays as "*The Taming of the Shrew*," "*Timon of Athens*," "*Pericles*," and

perhaps "Henry VIII." It is extremely doubtful that "The Two Noble Kinsmen," the first act of which some have supposed to be Shakespeare's and the rest continued and completed by John Fletcher, is in any part Shakespeare's at all.

Not enough has yet been investigated concerning this connection of Shakespeare's plays with his predecessors and his contemporaries, and with much of the older Elizabethan and Continental material. The dramatist in the past has been studied too far by himself and for himself. A beginning, however, is being made and a better opportunity offered, by the new editions of Elizabethan dramatists and contemporary documents undertaken by the Oxford and Cambridge and other Presses.

Nearly all the first plays of Shakespeare had prototypes: a ground plan that the dramatist worked upon. There was an old play on the victories of Talbot over the French, retold in "I Henry VI." There were old plays on the bloodshedding in the Wars of the Roses, recounted in "II and III Henry VI;" more than one old play, indeed, existed on the popular conception of the hump-backed, bloody Richard III. Plautus had an old play, the *Menæchmi*, on the confusion of two brothers; on this seems to have been built an old Elizabethan play, "The Historie of Error;" and this in turn became the ground work for Shakespeare's "The Comedy of Errors." An old double play, "The Troublesome Raigne of King John" in ten acts, or two parts, was the basis of Shakespeare's single play of "King John." There was possibly an older play on the subject of the deposed King "Richard II," and a wretched piece, "The Famous Victories of Henry V," suggested points to all three plays containing Prince Hal: both parts of "Henry IV" and "Henry V." Maybe there was an older play on Shylock, the Jew of Venice. Beyond question an older play explains much that is otherwise inexplicable in the Tragedy of Blood, "Titus Andronicus." There was an older "Hamlet" play with the ghost and all the other disturbing improbabilities, and it has been guessed, with some degree of assurance, that the writer of this old play was Thomas Kyd, the author of "The Spanish Tragedy."

I emphasize this phase of Shakespeare's early work, because it is just here that the most insoluble problems occur in connec-

tion with the history and development of Shakespeare's art. To me the periods of Shakespeare's work that have proved most rewarding, are two: that of the plays which traces the beginnings and growth of the dramatist's art, and that which displays his greatest achievement in comedy and tragedy.

In this work of revamping old stuff and improving old themes, it seems natural to suppose that Shakespeare began with the older chronicle form of play and the traditions of classical comedy and tragedy. Such a theory best explains what is perhaps the greatest *crux* in Shakespeare — the relation of "II and III Henry VI" to the two older plays, their originals, viz.: "The Contention Between the Two Houses of York and Lancaster," and the "True Tragedie of Richard, Duke of York," and the relation of all four of these, still further, to "I Henry VI" and "Richard III." The inextricable confusion can only be explained, it seems to me, by a reference to this process of working over old plays. While the theory may not be proved at every point, it is one of which I have become fairly convinced and upon which I have had the hardihood to write more than once.

The problem is this. We have six plays. There has been some to doubt that they are Shakespeare's at all — yet Shakespeare seems to have had a good deal to do with every one of the six. The subject of the Wars of the Roses was an interesting and a vital one historically, and from the point of view of the popular Tragedy of Blood was also essentially dramatic. There must have been originally an old play or plays on this subject — before Shakespeare engaged with the material at all. This original matter Shakespeare, most probably with others, worked over into the two plays existing in quarto form: "The Contention Between the Two Houses of York and Lancaster" and the "True Tragedie of Richard, Duke of York." Note the expression, "*True Tragedie*," implying that there was another inferior version and perhaps a rival performance by a theatrical company on the next block. I believe, consequently, that in these two plays, "The Contention" and the "True Tragedie," while not wholly, and possibly not largely, Shakespeare's, we have incorporated the oldest and first specimens of his work to be found.

A very little later it dawned upon the dramatist, that this material could be used to still further advantage. He could develop these two plays on the Wars of the Roses, prefix a play and affix a play — material for which already existed in previous plays — and connect all four, thus resulting into a tetralogy on the unfortunate reign of Henry VI, crowned by the figure of the wicked monster, whom these dissensions had generated, Richard III.

Whatever part of the original plays "The Contention" and the "True Tragedie," and even of the new plays thus produced, may have been by others — Peele, Lodge, or even Greene and Marlowe — the new conception of an historic tetralogy seems to have been that of one mind, and this one mind to have been Shakespeare's. The one name that emerges and certainly had a hand in them, though all four of the pieces were probably composite, as described, is Shakespeare's. All the changes, heightening, developing, expanding, seem to have this one object in view. An old play existed on Talbot's victories over the French; it could be reduced and altered. The events were those of the early days of Henry VI. It is only necessary to heighten the parts dealing with Talbot's bravery, lengthen the pathetic business of the death of Talbot and his young son into a lyrical outburst, introduce Henry VI as an ineffective young king just coming of age, indicate the beginning of the Wars of the Roses in the delightful scene of the plucking of the white and red roses in the Temple Garden — for whose can such poetry be save Shakespeare's, even at the beginning of his art? Finally, add the wooing of Margaret by Suffolk for his king (and for himself) as a good curtain — and there you are! The play is done and you may label it "I Henry VI" and let it precede the other two old quarto plays on the Wars of the Roses.¹

The Margaret Episode at the end of "I Henry VI" leads us to expect more — for it is unmistakably inserted at the close with this intention. It introduces a new element and serves as a transition to the following parts. The figure of Margaret is

¹ My arguments for this were stated some years ago in a paper in the Publications of the Modern Language Association entitled "The Episodes in 'I Henry VI.'"

the one character that is in all four plays of the tetralogy — from first to last. By a fictitious device — undoubtedly, it seems to me, the work of Shakespeare — Margaret appears in all four plays, unhistorically, it is true, but, dramatically, very effective: in the first two as a lover; in the last two, Cassandra-like, heaping curses and prophesying doom.

With the old Talbot play thus converted into a Henry VI play and this introduction now called "I Henry VI" completed, the dramatist returned to the old plays of "The Contention" and "The True Tragedie," dealing with the Wars of the Roses, in which it is most probable Shakespeare already had a decisive share. What would he now do? Why, naturally take these two plays with their excellent dramatic raw material, and in the light of "I Henry VI," develop them, extend them, expand them, intensify their dramatic and lyrical notes, and thus expanded and intensified call them "II and III Henry VI," respectively.

The two plays contain plenty of good stuff. Thus, the dying words of the conscience-stricken Cardinal Beaufort:

Comb down his hair: look, look! it stands upright,
Like lime-twigs set to catch my wingèd soul.
Give me some drink. . . .

And Warwick comments:

See how the pangs of death do make him grin!

Already in "III Henry VI" the deformed, hump-backed Richard is characterized by his monologue form:

I have no brother, I am like no brother,
And this word 'love' which grey beards call divine,
Be resident in men like one another
And not in me: I am myself alone.

The true conception is already there, and forthwith a final fourth play is appended: "Richard III." Richard had been the subject, seemingly, of more than one play before; but this is the first indication of any consistent psychological conception of the character. Many hands may have dealt with the original dramatic material in the four plays; but it seems that no one but Shakespeare — the same conscious artist, who developed later

into the creator of Hamlet, Iago, Othello and Lear — planned putting these four plays together into a sequence and one consistent whole with their fitting culmination in the imperious Richard. The characteristic psychology of the later plays may be already discerned in the earlier ones. Here are the definite marks of Shakespearean tragedy near its beginning. As in the later plays, there is the conflict between forces — a great waste of heroic qualities, courage, determination, great will — and somehow something that impels our sympathy. The tremendous will-power and the splendid audacity in courting Lady Anne is the justification of what would otherwise be an improbable and painful scene. The self-control in chasing away the visions of the night which are troubling a haunted conscience; the dying a death grandly and bravely on the battlefield worthy of a better cause — these qualities call forth admiration, even with a natural detestation of Richard's character. Full of crudities, irrelevances these four early history plays naturally are; they reveal their mixed origin and complex nature, indicate that they rest on other plays and contain elements we may accept as un-Shakespearean; but they show, too, the process of beginning, growing, strengthening work; characteristics that are later developed in the creation of the masterpieces of modern dramatic literature.

Another point anent the literary quality of "Richard III" may here be touched upon. It is in connection with the vexed relations of the quarto and the folio. The text of the English Globe and Cambridge editors, usually adopted without question, adheres in the main, as is known, to the quarto text, as an earlier version than that of the folio, and supposedly more nearly like Shakespeare's original manuscripts. Other editors like the American Richard Grant White, or the maker of the latest edition, Professor Neilson, in the American Cambridge Poets series, accept the folio copy of 1623 as a later, better and corrected form. The differences between the two views has been great and the discussion has sometimes degenerated into violent controversy. One point which seems to have escaped the advocates of one text or the other, I am convinced of. After going through hundreds upon hundreds of these variations — for they are legion — to my mind and to any literary feeling I possess, the

person who made many of these alterations from quarto to folio—often merely of a single word in a line—whether Shakespeare or not, was unquestionably a poet with distinctively subtle qualities. The Cambridge editors bluntly affirm that the quarto is probably from Shakespeare's copy. But may not the poet himself (for certainly it was some *poet*) have altered his own copy in the course of time to the great improvement of scores, nay hundreds, of lines? It will be found that change after change has been made to escape awkward iterations of words and syllables, to introduce a concrete or specific word in place of a general term, as *children* for *kindred* or *fathers* for *parents*, or to bring in an entirely new poetic idea. But the editors of the Cambridge text, having started off on a certain path in obedience to a theory, insistently keep it and will have none of these things.

It is, of course, beside the question, but I may frankly express the opinion for myself, that after working for some years over the variations between the quarto and folio copies of Shakespeare's plays and considering the number of misprints and errors in both, I am convinced that nothing like a perfect text of Shakespeare exists, nor in the nature of the case can very well exist. The elements that enter into the process are entirely too fanciful and subjective. None of the old copies is altogether trustworthy, and when we begin to alter, no two of us, for example, will agree as to the precise alteration to be made; nay, frequently, indeed, will not be even consistent in the treatment in different places of apparently the same phenomena.

This lack of consistency is the most grievous sin of all existing texts. Editors are capable of doing on one page what they calmly ignore on another. The English Globe and Cambridge text, generally accepted as the standard—and I shall not undertake to say any other is preferable—is open frequently to this charge of inconsistency from which all texts suffer; but to my feeling the Globe and Cambridge text is subject to the more damning fault of having been established by minds that, while remarkably accurate in details of textual criticism, seemingly had no adequate feeling for poetic distinction.

But we can see the beginner Shakespeare practising in Comedy and Tragedy no less than in the History Play. In perhaps the

latest edition of Shakespeare's plays, that of Professor Neilson in the American Cambridge Poets edition just mentioned, the editor has departed from the usual folio arrangement of the Comedies and the Tragedies, and has ventured to classify these according to content and to rearrange them in their presumed chronological order. In doing so he follows the traditional opinion that "Love's Labour's Lost" is Shakespeare's earliest Comedy. It may be so; but for a long time I have not been able to escape the feeling that much may be said for the "Comedy of Errors" being the first in point of time. Professor Baker, of Harvard, in his new book on Shakespeare's Growth as a Dramatist, places "Love's Labour's Lost" first and the "Comedy of Errors" later, on the ground of advance in dramatic structure. But this may easily be accounted for by the fact that in the "Errors" he was following an older construction, while "Love's Labour's Lost" is largely his own invention, and though later is structurally feebler, but in characterization is superior. In itself, it seems to me more natural that the dramatist in a first attempt should have followed older lines rather than have cut out for himself comparatively new paths.

Two plays of Plautus suggested the central episodes — the confusion of the two brothers, and the wife's dining with a stranger while the real husband beats in vain at the door outside for admittance. Upon this material seems to have been built the old play, the "Historie of Error," which Shakespeare used. Though this old play is known only by name and has long since disappeared, we can almost tell what it contained. It was probably originally downright crude and rough farce, some traits of which have been still retained. What Shakespeare did, as usual, even in his earliest period, was to add new elements, heighten the dramatic appeal, smooth roughnesses, and tone down violations of taste and even of morals. The shrewish wife is probably softened from a vixen; the whole courtesan business, no doubt elaborated in the original, is very much condensed, even to the point of obscurity; a stroke of genius adds another pair of twin brothers — the servants Dromio — making the laughable confusion between the two pairs, even as to one another, intricate beyond belief. I am, too, inclined to think, as everything

moves in pairs, that the charming sister, the first of Shakespeare's sensible, well-balanced women, was also created and added by the dramatist as a foil to the wife and mate for the brother. To distinguish the play further from its old form of absolute farce there is introduced the framework of the separated parents and children reunited in the end — a trait curiously enough revived and elaborated in all the latest plays of the dramatist's life: "Pericles," "Cymbeline," "Winter's Tale," and "The Tempest."

For the other two beginning comedies — "Love's Labour's Lost" and the "Two Gentlemen of Verona" — no original play is known to have existed. This, however, does not preclude the possibility of such older form, following the general method of work, and I am not sure that this was here also the case. In the "Two Gentlemen of Verona" there remains an echo of an older play, "Felismena," on a related subject. On the other hand, it may be said that perhaps in both these cases the dramatist tried to invent his own plots. Both plays deal incidentally with theories of right education — a young man's theories — that you cannot educate away from Nature, but only in recognition and in restraint of Nature's forces. Each is founded upon methods of the predecessors of Shakespeare — John Lyly and Robert Greene, respectively. "Love's Labour's Lost" is the best example in Shakespeare of the influence of Euphuism at the same time that it ridicules the extremes of Euphuism and preciosities of speech in the verbal extravagances of the preacher, the teacher, and the fantastical Spaniard — extravagances caught up and reflected ludicrously by the clown of the play. Alliterations, balanced forms of speech, word plays in great profusion, prose dialogue — all are in the manner of John Lyly — but the play echoes, too, other modes. The Spaniard is

A man in all the world's new fashion planted
That hath a mint of phrases in his brain.

But also the more serious and poetical portions of Biron and Rosaline, in the company of the King and Princess, are characterized by affectations:

Taffeta phrases, silken terms precise
Three-piled hyperboles, spruce affectation,
Figures pedantical. . . .

Biron declares,

I do forswear them.
Henceforth my wooing mind shall be express'd
In russet yeas and honest kersey noes.

Such a comedy is evidently no comedy of character, but a comedy of a young man's brilliant quips and words.

Controlled by the purists in speech, it has become the right sort of thing since Professor Clarence Child's admirable dissertation on "Euphuism," to limit the term specifically to the qualities and appearances in Lyly's work. But while we may well restrict the word to this special and technical sense, this usage has brought with it a considerable loss. There is needed another term to express the movement in English speech at the time—a necessary and on the whole beneficial movement both in its added refinements and in its extravagances—a vogue which Shakespeare's play illustrates as well as condemns. In the broader and more generic sense, Shakespeare's play of "Love's Labour's Lost" is at once an excellent example of the traits of a very real movement in the history of English speech at its finest, and a ridiculing of the same thing at its worst. The *very consciousness* of this, further inclines me to give a slightly later date to the play than is customary—and so to make it the second, or even more probably, the third, rather than the first of Shakespeare's comedies. The play is important as bearing upon the future development of Shakespeare's art; but especially so as illustrative of the dramatist's susceptibility to the influences of the times.

No less does the "Two Gentlemen of Verona" show a similar following of a fashion. This play is Shakespeare's first characteristically *romantic* play, as the wretched, but sweetly lyrical, Robert Greene had developed it before him. The reviewer in *The Nation*, of Mr. Churton Collins's new edition of Greene, has questioned Mr. Collins's statement of Shakespeare's indebtedness to Greene on the ground that it was nowhere to be proved. Maybe not. And yet I have long entertained the opinion that I found Mr. Collins holds, and must beg to dissent from the reviewers who demand mathematical demonstration. The romantic tangle of Love versus Friendship, the faithlessness and the

reconciliation, the disguises of the lady as a boy page (already to be found in *Lyly*), the Robin Hood-like outlaws, the absurdly weak ending — not caring how the play closed and who married whom, so long as the characters stood in pairs and effective groups for the ringing down of the curtain — all these are traits which recall qualities of Greene's work and tell of a poetical Shakespeare near the beginning of his art. Robert Greene was too positive a genius and prominent a figure for as skillful an adapter as William Shakespeare, beginner, wholly to pass by.

The beginnings of Shakespearean tragedy contain an even more instructive example of these origins. The *Tragedy of Blood*, so offensive to our nostrils and feeling, was a favorite product of Elizabeth's time. It was the physical as well as the psychical outcome of long decades of internecine war and religious persecution preceding Henry VIII's, Edward's, Mary's, and Elizabeth's reigns. Nor has the Anglo-Saxon mind ever wholly outgrown it. Our popular melodrama to-day—the villain-still-pursued-her sort of plot—also the violent imaginings of children, even the background of a play like the much-talked-of "*Great Divide*," by Mr. Moody, are direct descendants and are of a kind. It is of pirates on the high seas and scalping Indians, bold banditti, they play. This sentence, already penned, has found delightful confirmation in the children's extravaganza, "*Peter Pan*," by Mr. Barrie, as played for two seasons in New York by Miss Maude Adams. Its appeal is essentially based upon fundamental and universal traits. A tub of water may become the ocean and a few chips and splinters rival navies afloat. This is the explanation of the success of the penny-dreadful and the old-fashioned dime novel, now adulterated and, like many other food products, marked down to a nickel.

"*Titus Andronicus*" is the first pure tragedy associated with Shakespeare's name. In details it is an unrelieved story of bloodshed and cruelty and horror, after the manner of the old tragedies of Seneca, so popular in the mind of the Renaissance and so abhorrent to us of to-day. There is murder, revenge, supernatural agency, and all the paraphernalia of the species. To an unprepared mind, who does not know the type, the play is simply awful — it reeks with blood, and strong tastes must

these sixteenth century Englishmen have had to accept and digest such meat. Many have doubted that Shakespeare, who later shows such rare delicacy in handling disagreeable subjects, could possibly, even in the crude period of youth, have written "Titus Andronicus." Like Falstaff, they argue, his 'instinct' would have preserved him. But contrary to former opinions, which compared the play only with Shakespeare's later work, independent of its evolution and surroundings, it is now generally believed that "Titus Andronicus" *is* Shakespeare's in this sense: it is an old play worked over and given new form by him. Its very extravagances bear the hallmark of his early period. Do you wish a bloody tragedy? — and sporting Kyd and Kit Marlowe had made the species a fine thing of thrill and shudder, with suicide, murder, rape, and ghosts. Do *you*, too, want a bloody tragedy, he seems to say to his theatre manager, and break up the rival show across the street? I shall let the blood flow in gallons.

There was more than one old play on the subject. You observe the Roman title — for Englishmen flattered themselves by locating the scenes of horrible plays in other lands than their own. The dramatist subjects this material to the process already described. An old German version and a Dutch version have been discovered — for the English actors were very popular on the Continent, in Holland and Germany and Austria, and carried these plays over with them. From these two Continental plays we can tell pretty well what the old play must have been like and what were Shakespeare's personal contributions. "The main features of the Shakespearean play which cannot be proved to have existed in the earlier dramas, are the rivalry between Saturninus and Bassianus for the throne, the funeral of Titus's sons killed in war; the sacrifice of Alarbus; the kidnapping of Lavinia by Bassianus, with the death of Mutius; the sending of young Lucius with presents to the sons of Tamora; and the banquet scene in III, ii, which appears only in the first folio and is perhaps a later addition" — (Neilson).

Leave out, if you can, in imagination, the foundation of the horrible plot which is not Shakespeare's. Accepting that — and there is proof that it was popular with strong Elizabethan tastes

—what would naturally a young poet make of it? You will observe at once the bountiful references to Nature and animal life, and the richness of poetic allusion. For instance:

Fresh tears stood on her cheeks, as doth the honey-dew
Upon a gathered lily almost wither'd.

Not the least good line is the one instanced by Burke in his "Essay on the Sublime and the Beautiful:"

When will this fearful slumber have an end?

Historically, "Titus Andronicus" is very important in Shakespearean evolution. It is a link between the murders and horrors of Kyd's "Spanish Tragedy" and the poet's own stupendous production of "Hamlet" in the plenitude of his powers, when he never worked better. For "Hamlet" belongs in every point of its origin to the type of the Tragedy of Blood. It is based upon an older play, "Hamiet," in the method described, and was due to a second revival of this species of bloody tragedy about 1600, midway in Shakespeare's career. Only the mature dramatist was prepared to make full use of his opportunity which he did not and could not before. This lost original "Hamlet" play is often referred to, and there can be no doubt of its existence. It seems very likely that it was one of Kyd's productions and it became the laughing-stock and butt of actors who ridiculed its absurd ghost crying like a fish-wife, "Hamlet, Revenge." This unpromising material Shakespeare seems to have taken hold of in the very wantonness of conscious mastery. We almost fancy him saying: See this fashion which is again current, observe this despised thing; and look at the rival concern across the street, with the flaring tallow-dips and burning tapers, trying to attract custom from us with a sensational play. This thing you have laughed at, I shall make you pause over. I see in it, ghost and all, not a tissue of absurdities, but possible agonizings which even question existence. Here it is — this *is* a play — a Tragedy of Blood, as it can be. Here is your ghost — preserved, and a real live one — though so cloaked about that, when at last he enters, you may well doubt, even in the First Act, his actual existence to any but Hamlet's excited brain.

Here are adultery, murder, madness, suicide, and deaths galore. I have let the curtain fall on a charnel house.

All are dead and murdered at the close, a full house: a sorry knave, Polonius, and his son and daughter; a King and a Queen, the father, "Hyperion to a Satyr," and Hamlet, "Take him for all in all, we shall not look upon his like again." Horatio alone remains:

Absent thee from felicity awhile
And in this harsh world draw thy breath in pain
To tell my story. . . .

begs the dying Hamlet. And his friend replies with a prescience of a better world, rare in Shakespeare's lines, who, absorbed in portraying his characters, conceals any personal thoughts of his own:

Now cracks a noble heart. Good night, sweet prince,
And flights of angels sing thee to thy rest.

Mr. Bradley has happily remarked: "It is just what Hamlet never had and most needs — Rest!"

Let a college Freshman, as I experience almost every year, tell in his own words the unadorned plot and story of "Hamlet" — relieved of its magic of poetry and its depth of complex characterization — and you would still ridicule its possibilities, as much as the playwrights of old. Read the play for yourself, even despite this discouragement and distaste for literature your own students sometimes conspire to give you, and there is a feeling of awe — the purging pity and terror of Aristotle's definition. You have forgot the adultery, the blood-letting, the madness, and the suicide, the ghost and the deaths; you are left pondering over a tragedy of human character and human will. This tragic woe is not of the fall of Thebes or Pelops line, caused from without; but the actions and emotions of character spring from within the man himself and determine destiny. This is the transformation that is wrought by this maker of modern tragedy.

The two narrative poems, "Venus and Adonis," and "Lucrece," were just as imitative of a general manner and just as superior to that manner in their special characteristics. They were both dedicated to the Earl of Southampton in very interest-

ing prose dedications signed by Shakespeare and revealing an intimate personal touch. In both the youthful poet threw himself with accustomed ardor. Both poems doubtless had their origin in the demand of the young dandies about town, to the company of whom the young Earl belonged. In the sixteenth century, when "Venus and Adonis" appeared, it was thought to be a very pretty poem, and was so popular, it is said, that men went to sleep with the volume under their heads. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, by a change in taste, the poem came to be thought immoral. Its latest editor, Mr. Sidney Lee, takes literally the statement "the first heire of my invention," and assigns the composition back to the Stratford days of the young poet. Personally, I must think that the phrase refers to the first endeavor of this kind that the poet had attempted — a continued narrative poem, as distinguished from his miscellaneous work and totally different dramatic performance based upon older material. The poem thus seems to me to belong to the period of early comedy and tragedy and to be blended with the spirit of both — a typical production of a luxuriant and youthful poetic imagination.

In our own superior and analytical generation, instead of exuberant poems, we have portentous examples of fiction like "Jude the Obscure," written by middle-aged men, without illusions — this novel, indeed, appearing as a serial in a popular American family magazine designed for home consumption. Perhaps some day this, too, may not be thought the healthiest reading *virginibus puerisque*.

The early Sonnets were all equally imitative of a fashion. Mr. Sidney Lee has done yeoman's service in unearthing the history and showing the vogue of the sonnet in Italy, in France, and in England. Likewise I can refer to an admirable paper on the same subject, "Foreign Influences on Shakespeare's Sonnets," by Mr. David Klein, which was edited and published in THE SEWANEE REVIEW a little more than two years ago. In these sonnets, Shakespeare unquestionably follows admitted conventions. Every one of the conceits and imagined situations may be duplicated. We need not be at all surprised, for we have already found the same thing in the Plays. But, as before, there

is also something more to be said. The sonnet love sequence had its great prototype in England in Sir Philip Sidney's "Astrophel and Stella," and noble as some of Sidney's sonnets are, tested as a sequence and individually, they fall immeasurably below Shakespeare's. Again he dares the thing most in vogue and does it better. In neither Sidney's nor Shakespeare's case does it make much difference whether these poems were transcripts of actual personal experience and suffering or not. Shakespeare was a poet and dramatist, and he was more intense in his imagination, more powerful in his intellectuality, more true in his emotions than others of his predecessors and contemporaries. Rich imagination and ripe experience were needed for the full-blooded tragedies; and while the Sonnets are notably unequal in merit, something of the same maturity rings out in the notes of the greatest of them.

I merely illustrate the magic of some of these lines, familiar and always deserving of repetition. Take the one beginning:

Full many a glorious morning have I seen. . . .
Gilding pale streams with heavenly alchemy.

or,

When I have seen by Time's fell hand defaced
The rich proud cast of outworn buried age,
When sometime lofty towers I see down-razed
And brass eternal slave to mortal rage;
When I have seen the hungry ocean gain
Advantage on the kingdom of the shore,
And the firm soil win of the watery main
Increasing store with loss and loss with store.

Or take this splendid quatrain with its fourth great line:

That time of year thou may'st in me behold
When yellow leaves, or none, or few, do hang
Upon those boughs which shake against the cold,
Bare ruin'd choirs, where late the sweet birds sang.

As I go about the abundant woods of our Sewanee Mountain, after late October's and early November's turning of the foliage and the falling of leaves typical of the fall of all of us, and I look at the tracteries of limbs and twigs, "with old December's bareness everywhere," as the Sonnet has it, suggesting in an

academic environment the Gothic architecture of adjoining choir stalls, the line recurs with a new meaning:

Bare ruin'd choirs where late the sweet birds sang.

Finally, take this splendid example:

When in disgrace with fortune and men's eyes
I all alone beweepe my outcast state,
And trouble deaf heaven with my bootless cries
And look upon myself and curse my fate,
Wishing me like to one more rich in hope,
Featured like him, like him with friends possess'd,
Deserving this man's art and that man's scope,
With what I most enjoy contented least;
Yet in these thoughts myself almost despising,
Haply I think on thee, and then my state,
Like to the lark at break of day arising
From sullen earth, sings hymns at heaven's gate;
For thy sweet love remember'd such wealth brings
That then I scorn to change my state with kings.

To me Shakespeare's personality and art, while following accepted forms, burst beyond the mere shell and husk of these forms. These poems may be exercises — and it is interesting to know historically what were the conventions and types which the poet followed — but also in such studies we must take heed to remember that on this same instrument it was a new and a very real poet piping.

That I have entertained no reference to the Baconian and related theories of Shakespearean authorship will be better understood at this juncture. The theory had its origin in America, and has always been extremely popular in this country, and latterly has become so in Germany. The latest book on the subject, I believe, is one by Herr Professor Karl Bleibtreu, who seeks the authorship of the plays not in Bacon, but in the comparatively unknown Earl of Rutland.

The man who wrote these Sonnets, the early narrative poems, the plays — histories, comedies, and tragedies — was all of a piece. It is literarily inconceivable, to my mind, that he should have written the *Novum Organum* and *Magna Instauration* or the "Essays" or have been deprived of a justiceship for avarice — all of which seems, too, of quite another piece. If there be such a

thing as personality of the author, surely the thoughts, emotions, and expressions of the greatest figure in modern literature must be such a psychological entity. Else all canons of literary criticism fail!

In the present paper I have sought to reveal this personality at the beginning of each literary species and suggest how, working in its special environment, it was evolved normally by the successful imitation of others' example and the gradual transcending of others' work. In a remaining paper I shall endeavor to ascertain some of the traits of this personality as revealed in its later work, and particularly at its fullest in "The Themes of Tragedy."

JOHN BELL HENNEMAN.

The University of the South.

WHAT CAUSED THE PANIC

Whenever there has been a panic or signs of one in Wall Street, a certain clique of railroad bankers, who pose in the newspapers as financial experts, push themselves forward to explain the cause of the trouble. In the estimation of these parties, questions relating to panics can be solved only by bankers, and no one else is competent to express an opinion on the subject. And in every case the explanation which they put forward is one that is best suited to promote their own particular interests. For example, they want the government to issue a currency based on bank assets, said assets being made up largely of railroad securities. Therefore they assert that the stringency which caused the panic of 1907 and tight money in former years, is due to our inelastic currency, which fails to expand when most needed to meet the wants of increasing business. Money is most needed around crop-moving times, and it is then that the defects in our currency are most seriously felt. As one expert puts it, we have two months in the year when a larger amount of funds is needed to move crops, and ten months when there is a plethora of money, after the crops are moved and paid for. And so we are told that it was the failure of the currency to expand, to meet this crop-moving demand, that caused the stringency and the panic.

To popularize this doctrine and force Congress to give us asset currency, its advocates have begun what they call a "campaign of education." But it is a false teaching which they propagate, for they are misleading the public on some very important points.

For instance, the term elastic, or emergency, currency is intended to create the impression that the stringency is only temporary — for about two months in the Autumn — and that when the crops have been duly marketed, money will become easier and this emergency currency will be recalled. Thus, in his 1904 address, Mr. Hepburn says: "Credit or currency must be provided to carry the products of farm and factory to the marts of the world, in order that the return prices may meet and extin-

guish local demands and restore normal conditions." Here Mr. Hepburn stops short at a very important point and misleads his hearers as to what follows. He seeks to create the impression that after the crops have been duly marketed, Europe will pay cash for them, and that this cash will meet and extinguish local demands, and dispense with further need of the emergency currency.

Now the fact is that for a number of years back there have been no return prices worth mentioning. This was notably the case in 1904, when this address was delivered. In that year, instead of receiving cash in settlement of our trade balance, we actually exported over \$59,000,000 more gold and silver than we imported. Why was this? What became of the return prices that were to meet and extinguish local demands? And what became of the return prices in the previous seven years of our big foreign trade?

Surely a campaign of education that stops short at this point is not likely to impart a very complete knowledge of the causes of money stringency and panics. I propose therefore to begin my discussion where Mr. Hepburn leaves off.

This question of the failure to get cash payments for our enormous exports of merchandise attracted much attention in 1901. At that time the current theory was that about \$250,000,000 of each year's trade balance went to offset our annual foreign debts for interest dues, tourists' expenses, etc., and that the balance went to buy back American securities, and to invest in foreign undertakings and in foreign bonds. In his article on the American invasion, Frank A. Vanderlip estimates that in the preceding four years we had thus bought back \$1,200,000,000 worth of our securities. To a request for his authority for this estimate Mr. Vanderlip replied as follows:

"I am in receipt of your letter and note your desire to find statistics verifying a statement I made in a recent magazine that the United States had bought back from Europe about \$1,200,000,000 of our securities. This I regret to say is impossible. There are no definite figures, nor is there any way in which you can set about to prove my assertion. The calculation is entirely one of estimate, in which many collateral pieces of information entered."

Thus it will be seen that the sole basis of this claim of foreign liquidation is mere guesswork — calculation based on estimates. Mr. Vanderlip is quite right in saying there is no way in which I could set about to prove his assertion; but after considerable labor I have found some fairly definite facts and figures which disprove it.

In my article on "Trade Balances" in *THE SEWANEE REVIEW* July-September, 1903, I presented the reports of dealings for foreign account on the New York Stock Exchange, as published in New York newspapers, which showed an excess of foreign purchases in every one of these four years. The net purchases for the four years amounted to some 3,700,000 shares. I gave also a list of foreign investments in our stocks and properties outside of the Exchange, which amounted to about \$320,000,000. So that if we put the value of the stocks bought on the Exchange at \$50 a share, the total foreign investments amounted to nearly \$500,000,000 in these four years. In reality it was much more, for I have since learned that the Germans put over \$80,000,000 in Union Pacific, and that a large portion of our Spanish war bonds went abroad in 1898.

A statement of foreign dealings here from January, 1902, to May, 1904, appeared in my second article in *THE SEWANEE REVIEW* of July-September, 1904. These two statements are the only detailed record ever published of such dealings and, excepting an error in regard to the Rock Island issue, I have every reason to believe that it is a reasonably correct statement.

The claim of foreign liquidation continued to be exploited, however, in 1904 and 1905, in spite of all the evidence to the contrary. Thus, A. D. Noyes, Financial Editor of the *Evening Post*, in his article on "Finance" (*Forum*, April-June, 1904) says: "It is, however, logical to suppose that the stocks and bonds which foreigners bought in 1903 were largely sold back to New York in the excited rise of prices during the fall of 1904 and the spring of 1905."

Referring to the outflow of gold in January, 1905, the *Evening Sun* says: "It should not be forgotten that there is very good banking house opinion for saying that at the bottom of the movement in foreign exchange against the country for the last

three months, there has been and continues to be a steady trickle of American securities back to this city."

Now, the fact is that instead of this liquidation, or "steady trickle," vouched for by "good banking house opinion," foreign dealings in our securities in this period exceeded that of former years. According to the *Brooklyn Eagle*, the purchases in the last half of 1904 netted 182,000 shares and for the first half of 1905, 100,000; and the greatest excess was in the six months from October 1, 1904, to March 30, 1905.

But these exchange deals were but a drop in the bucket compared to the outside deals, which were on a larger scale than in any former twelve months' period, and included \$75,000,000 Southern Pacific, \$50,000,000 Western Pacific, \$50,000,000 Pennsylvania railroad bonds. All told, foreign banking houses took upwards of \$800,000,000 worth of securities in this period, and the bulk of these were undoubtedly sold abroad. Referring to the heavy foreign investment, the *Wall Street Journal*, December 17, 1904, has this: "About the most interesting development in the general bond market is the purchase of Southern Pacific and other early maturing bonds by the international banking houses. There is more money in this than in shipping gold."

As to 1905, the *Bankers' Magazine* for April, 1905, says: "The heavy purchases of American securities for London account caused large offerings of bills of exchange and forced sterling nearly to the gold export point." There was some selling for foreign account in this period, but the net result was largely in favor of the purchases. Thus the *Post*, April 15, 1905, Mr. Noyes's own paper, says: "With this week's purchases of American stocks and bonds for foreign account, the European holdings of American securities abroad are, according to international banking authority, greater now than at any time since the movement of 1901-1902." In spite of these sales of securities, it seems that we were also borrowing abroad. According to the *Post's* Paris correspondent, December 31, 1904, we then owed Europe several hundred million dollars. February 18, 1905, the *Post* estimated that by sales of securities abroad his debt had been cut down to \$50,000,000, and on March 18 it

claimed that it had been fully canceled by further deals of the same nature. We appear to have gotten into grief immediately after this, however, for the reports show heavy borrowing clear up to June 24, 1905, when the *Post* estimated the debt incurred since April at from \$50,000,000 to \$75,000,000.

This history of foreign dealings here sufficiently disposes of these claims of foreign liquidations of American securities at that time.

It likewise knocks the foundation from under the whole theory of the disappearance of our foreign trade balances as exploited by Messrs. Vanderlip, Noyes, Hepburn, and others. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905, the statistics of our foreign trade shows these results:

Net exports of merchandise.....	\$401,000,000.00
Net exports of gold.....	38,000,000.00
Net exports of silver.....	21,000,000.00

Now, if, as this current theory asserts, our annual foreign debts do not exceed \$250,000,000, then we should have imported \$150,000,000 in cash, or bought back that amount of securities, or had it standing to our credit abroad. But instead of this we exported \$59,000,000 more gold than we imported, sold abroad hundreds of millions worth more securities than we got back, and borrowed many millions more.

The only explanation of this "chain of absurdities," as a London paper termed it, is that in our dealings with the outside world we are running behind. The fundamental error of the current theory is that it greatly underestimates these annual foreign debts. Instead of amounting to only \$250,000,000, they were three times that amount in 1905, and were growing all the time.

For that period a proper estimate of these various debts would have been about as follows:

Interest, dividends and profits on foreign capital.....	\$300,000,000.00
Immigrants' hoards.....	200,000,000.00
Expenses of Americans abroad.....	125,000,000.00
Cost of ocean freight, etc.....	125,000,000.00
Total.....	\$750,000,000.00

According to this estimate, instead of having a surplus of \$150,000,000 at the end of the fiscal year 1905, we piled up a deficit of some \$350,000,000. We exported \$59,000,000 in gold and silver in part settlement of this deficit, and in order to stave off cash payments of the balance we sold or pledged all these securities abroad.

It may seem incredible that all of our great financial lights, prominent bankers, Treasury officials and financial writers could be so far out of the way as the above estimate implies, and no doubt it will occur to some that I am rash in opposing such eminent authorities. But in view of certain facts which came to light in the summer of 1901, I feel that I have a right to be confident about the matter.

From September, 1899, to May 22, 1901, it was claimed that we were lending abroad a good part of the surplus alleged to be due on our trade balances. In June, 1900, Hon. Jefferson M. Levy, the banker, estimated these loans at over \$500,000,000. The *New York Times*, January 7, 1901, confirmed this estimate. May 15, 1901, the same paper reduced its estimate to "several hundred millions," and this was the amount agreed upon by bankers and financial critics generally.

This cheery view did not, as may be readily imagined, square with my ideas of the situation, and in two letters to the *New York World* (June, 1900) and the *Brooklyn Citizen* (October 1900) I insisted that the boot was on the other leg — that instead of Europe owing us, it was we that owed Europe. The day before the May panic of 1901 I had another letter in the *Times*, in which I reiterated this view, and added that the events of the next few months would confirm it. Here is the letter:

"In a recent editorial on 'The Liquidation of Trade Balances,' you state that 'speculation as to how Europe will settle her enormous balances with this country are complicated by uncertainty as to how such settlement has been effected in the past.'

"Now, I suggest that if our financial experts will look in an entirely opposite direction, and put a common sense construction on what they see, their 'speculation' will be, not as to how Europe will settle its balances with us, but as to how we will settle our balances with Europe.

"According to the current theory, about one half of our trade balances is needed to cancel our annual foreign debts for freights, interest dues, and tourists' expenses; the rest goes to pay for returned securities, or is being loaned abroad. But I contend that this theory is wrong. A careful study of the question has convinced me that in recent years these annual foreign debts have grown so enormous that now they more than offset our trade balances, and so we have to export specie and mortgage securities and properties to square the account.

"Of course, I know that this pessimistic view will provoke a smile of derision from those who believe in all the fine talk about our becoming a 'creditor nation,' but nevertheless, the course of events in the next few months will, I am convinced, prove that it is a correct view of the matter."

Just two weeks after this letter was published the financial world was startled by a dispatch from the Paris correspondent of the *Post*, May 22, 1901, to the effect that American capitalists were at that time borrowing immense sums abroad on finance bills. This news was scouted at first. Even the *Post* was so infected with the "creditor nation" lunacy that it refused to believe its own correspondent, and the next day it quoted several foreign bankers as denying it; but later revelations proved that the statement was true.

It is now admitted that we owed at that time about \$250,000,000. So that instead of being \$250,000,000 to the good we were that much to the bad. It will thus be seen that the great financial experts were \$500,000,000 out of the way in their estimate of the international money situation, and that my view of that matter as stated in the *World* in June, 1900, and in the *Times* in May 1901, was fully confirmed.

Among the experts who have exploited this yarn that we were lending immense sums abroad, were Secretary Gage, Henry Clews, Chauncey M. Depew, R. G. Dun & Company, A. P. Hepburn, Frank A. Vanderlip, Jacob H. Schiff, Mint Director George E. Roberts, and a host of others who are now engaged in the "campaign of education" to prove that the want of asset currency caused the panic of 1907. In an address to the Chicago Bankers' Club, March, 1901, Mr. Roberts exuded this: "Our trade balances are so large that to attempt to collect them

in cash would ruin our customers. A nation with power to amass such credits becomes of necessity an investor in all parts of the world."

Those American bankers who were scurrying all over Europe to borrow these immense sums must have winked the other eye when they read Mr. Roberts' boastful utterance.

It is always claimed that these bankers borrowed this money to finance their big schemes. This was true, but not in the sense usually understood. The money they borrowed was due abroad on account of this yearly deficit. The one-day panic of December, 1899, which was precipitated by the outflow of gold, showed that we could not stand a heavy loss of the metal. The export of \$250,000,000, which was what we owed abroad in 1901, would certainly have started another panic and paralyzed the boom in stocks that was under way at the time. This method of staving off gold exports is precisely the same as that adopted by the Morgan-Belmont syndicate in 1895, when they contracted to protect the Treasury reserve. They did it by selling and pledging enough securities abroad to offset the foreign demand for the metal.

The boldest advocate of the current theory, the *Times*, once asserted that "All theories regarding whether we owe 'abroad' or 'abroad' owes us, must yield to the touchstone of foreign exchange."

On this point, of course, we all agree, providing that we know just what influences foreign exchange during the period under discussion.

If, for example, our net exports of merchandise amount to \$400,000,000, as it did in 1905, it would seem as though "abroad" owed us. But if at the end of the year we find that we exported more specie than we imported, and have also sold or pledged vast amounts of securities to avert further exports, it is morally certain that we owe "abroad" or, to put it another way, if we peddle out securities, financial bills, etc., to the extent of over \$500,000,000, as it is universally admitted that we did in the two and a half years prior to June 30, 1902, without getting a dollar in cash (as the net exports of specie, gold and silver, in this period exceeded the imports), it is equally certain that

we owed 'abroad' that much money. We kept down foreign exchange, and averted an export of specie, by selling or pledging all these securities.

Now, the history of the period conclusively proves that the big bankers have been thus manipulating foreign exchange to avert gold shipments ever since then. And the best proof of the fact is furnished by the *Times* itself. Referring to a possible outflow, the *Times*, February 14, 1903, says: "The unfavorable effect of gold exports, although more sentimental than real, never fails to affect our securities to some extent. Those most interested in our securities being our most powerful financial leaders can be counted upon to do all they can to delay the outflow or confine it to the smallest possible limit." Referring to what had already been done in this direction, A. D. Noyes, in his article on "Finance" (*Forum*, April-June, 1903) says: "The season's market for foreign exchange has, however, been managed with the greatest skill, and prevention of gold exports has been made possible through a series of international operations in the money market."

The "greatest skill" here referred to consisted simply in borrowing abroad on loan bills to stay the efflux until enough securities could be sold abroad to square the account. And these two statements prove that the Faith Cure Pool formed in 1902 to stem the tide had become a permanent affair. But each year it requires more of this "skill" and more securities to effect the purpose. Here are a few reports that bear on this question: "Among the factors which contribute to the easier tone of sterling exchange is the export of large quantities of stocks to Europe. The facts in the case are that large blocks of securities are being sent abroad with every steamer, and this serves to depress the rate for sterling here."—(*Evening Sun*, March 23, 1904). "Most of the notes of Baltimore & Ohio and Norfolk & Western were taken abroad. This class of notes and certificates are being eagerly taken by foreign capitalists, which serves to explain why sterling exchange keeps below the shipping point, and prevents for the present the larger shipments of gold that were expected."—(*Globe*, April 14, 1904). "But whenever exchange advances and the money market shows signs of hardening,

finance bills are offered freely, causing a decline in exchange and an easier tone in the money market."—(*Wall Street Journal*, April 3, 1905). "We have thus far issued \$80,000,000 in finance bills to avert the efflux of gold."—(*Brooklyn Eagle*, July 2, 1905). "We are now borrowing abroad to check the efflux of gold."—(*Journal of Commerce*, November 11, 1905). "It was only our big borrowings abroad that checked the outflow of gold."—(*Wall Street Journal*, December 13, 1905). "It is years and years since we owed as much to the outside world as now."—(*Eagle*, May 13, 1906).

These are but a few of the reports found in the New York papers showing that the peddling of securities abroad was to avert gold exports. They also prove beyond the shadow of a doubt that our balances are not nearly big enough to cancel these annual debts, and that this export of securities is to settle the deficit without shipping gold. Since 1901 this yearly deficit has undoubtedly increased. There has been a steady increase in the amounts due for earnings of foreign capital, immigrants' hoards, tourists' expenses, and freights, while at the same time our net export of merchandise has been falling off so that the deficit was growing larger from both ends. And accordingly the efforts to stave off gold exports in settlement of it grew more burdensome every year. Some idea of the extent of this burden may be gathered from the fact that in the five years prior to December, 1905, the two leading representatives of foreign capital, J. P. Morgan & Co., and Kuhn, Loeb & Co., floated \$2,700,000,000 worth of railroad securities, and the reports show that the bulk of them were taken for foreign account. Other large amounts were floated abroad by Speyer & Co. and other foreign banking houses.

The clearest proof that we have thus been piling up an enormous debt abroad is furnished by certain facts that came out in 1906, concerning which there is no dispute. According to an investigation made by the London *Economist* and the London *Statist*, our borrowings from London and Paris alone in the six months prior to June, 1906, reached the enormous total of \$450,000,000. We also borrowed large sums from Holland and Germany. During this period foreign bankers took over \$500,000,-

ooo worth of securities, including two issues of Pennsylvania bonds, \$100,000,000 (sold in Paris), \$50,000,000 telephone bonds, \$35,000,000 Lake Shore bonds, and a big block of New York City bonds. How many of these issues went as collateral for the loans, I am unable to say.

About this time there was another change for the worse in the situation. Heretofore, we had been borrowing to avert the outflow of gold. But in 1906 the conditions were such that we had to borrow, not only to keep what we had, but also to draw more gold from Europe. What was the cause of this change? The oracles told us that it was but another proof that business had outgrown the money supply. But they did not prove this; they simply asserted it.

The most reasonable answer, indeed the only one capable of proof, is that the absorption of our currency by that portion of these migratory immigrants, who take their hoards away on their persons, was beginning to be felt. That portion of these hoards which was deposited in the foreign banks here could be loaned out here again, providing the foreign bankers could borrow enough abroad to offset the demands of the immigrants when presented on the other side. But the other portion of these hoards that was carried out of the country in the pockets of the immigrants could not, of course, be restored to general circulation. So we had to make up for the loss by borrowing foreign gold to avert financial disaster. During the summer and fall of 1906, we kept on borrowing to hold what coin we had and to get more from Europe. When A. D. Noyes was in Europe he found that experts over there estimated that we then owed \$500,000,000. Later on, the *Times*, October 29, 1906, put the debt at \$750,000,000. Possibly we reduced this debt somewhat with crop exports, but we continued to borrow during every week of November and December. The *Post's* Paris correspondent, December 29, 1906, estimated the debts at that time at \$600,000,000.

This method of avoiding the inevitable had to come to an end some time. After putting out some \$300,000,000 worth of securities in the first ten weeks of 1907, we had the panic of March 14. After this event the oracles declared that liquidation had

run its course and the worst was over, as we had never had two panics in one year. But while they were still boasting, the August panic came along to prove how little they knew about the situation.

After the March panic, a well-known financier, voicing the sentiment of his kind, christened it the "Roosevelt panic," and declared that the trouble was due to persecution and hostility to railroads, which caused a lack of confidence among investors. As to this, it can be said that during this administration the railroads have sold more securities and have obtained better prices for them than in any similar period of history. Even in the first quarter of 1907, when the fires of persecution were growing hotter than ever, and when there was as yet no sign that His Strenuosity had abated at all his strenuousness, the sale of such securities was of a record nature. A curious feature about this affair is that it was the roads whose owners have excited most of the hostility, that have put out the most securities. Another circumstance which so strikingly refutes this explanation of the trouble as to excite surprise that it has not been noticed before, is the condition of the banks at that time.

If hostility or anything else was causing lack of confidence in railroad stocks, there would certainly have been a rush of capital into other lines, or at least a congestion of idle funds in banks. But neither of these was the case. The stringency was general. And instead of any congestion of money in banks, the statistics show that their proportion of the stock of money had been steadily growing smaller before March, 1907.

Other financial leaders declared that, while hostility may have hastened the trouble, our inelastic currency was the basic cause of it.

Now the fact is, that coming when it did, this panic completely upset the whole argument for emergency currency. For the essence of this argument is, that it is the failure of currency to expand around crop-moving times that causes tight money and panics; and that when this season is over the "return prices meet and extinguish local demands" and this makes money plentiful. But this trouble of 1907 came in March, after the crops had been marketed and paid for. And 1907 was no exception to this

rule; for we have had tight money from December to March and even later in most of the past eight years.

Against these several theories of the matter I offer another, which is based upon the international commodities, specie, and securities, as herein set forth.

The history of this movement furnishes unmistakable proof that in our dealings with the outside world we are running behind. We are paying out more for the use of foreign capital, foreign labor, and for expenditures abroad than our exports of merchandise can offset. And it is the absorption of our currency in settlement of the deficit that is the main cause of all our financial woes.

This explains why Mr. Hepburn's "return prices" never meet to "extinguish local demands." It also explains why it is, that instead of getting those return prices, we have been selling and pledging securities abroad to avert gold exports in settlement of the deficit and to bring gold here. And finally it explains why it is that although we have a greater supply of money than any other country, we also have more severe financial panics. Thus far, the promoting foreign bankers, who are also our most influential financial leaders, have managed to hide this great fact from public view by averting gold exports in settlement of these yearly deficits and by befuddling the public mind as to the nature of our borrowings abroad. But there was one fact about these borrowings which, it would seem, ought long ago to have opened the eyes of the public to the true situation. This was the international movement of specie. If, for example, our trade balances had been large enough even to offset these annual foreign debts during the calendar year 1906, when we borrowed more than \$600,000,000, then we should have imported that much gold. But instead of this we imported only \$108,000,000. At the same time, this circumstance points with unerring certainty to the one great cause of the stringency. It proves that during 1906 the foreign banks had at least \$500,000,000 of our money in their vaults. As a matter of fact they had more. The \$600,000,000 was owed to European banks. The reports of Canadian banks showed that they had \$85,000,000 loaned here; while the Japanese banks had \$60,000,000.

Currency reformers always insist that the reason why foreign countries never have such severe panics is because of the superiority of their monetary systems. But they carefully conceal the fact that foreign monetary systems are not subjected to the strain that is put upon ours. For no other country has to foot the bills of so great an army of tourists and absentees, no other country has to pay out such vast sums to alien laborers and capitalists. When this fact finally dawns upon the public mind, the attempt to saddle the responsibility for our troubles upon the currency system will collapse in a night.

While currency defects were most generally assigned as the cause of the panics, there were a few who admitted that the trouble had begun two years before. Indeed, the money market was headed that way in 1900, when we started this borrowing on a large scale. During 1903-1904, we floated so many securities abroad to keep off gold exports, that Europe became alarmed, and in 1905 we began to put out still more finance bills and short-term notes. At the end of that year, the *Post*, December 30, said: "The stock speculation and the banking situation would repeatedly have broken down but for foreign borrowing." One year later, December 29, 1906, the same paper had this statement: "We have borrowed abroad more heavily than ever before to sustain the speculative edifice, and have done so at the highest rates on record." Here are two plain admissions that we would have collapsed but for foreign loans here.

In this same issue of the *Post* I note several statements by its Paris correspondent which are pertinent to this discussion. After stating that it is our enormous debts which are the main cause of the difficulties abroad, he propounds this question: "How comes it that the United States, passing as they are through a period of all but incredible prosperity, with their commercial exports incessantly increasing, and with an excess even in export of securities, do not manage to pay off once and for all their European debt. Why, above all things, should the debt be nowadays steadily increased? The question is one which seems to me not at all impossible to answer."

Answering this question the correspondent proceeds to show that the amounts due to other countries for immigrants' savings,

expenses of American tourists, and earnings of foreign capital largely overtop our trade balances, leaving us with a yearly deficit, the settlement of which causes so much annoyance and worry to Europe and ourselves.

This is a fairly clear confirmation of the theory I am advocating in this article, and have already advocated in *THE SEWANEE REVIEW*. It is a curious coincidence that it was the Paris correspondent of the *Post* who, in 1901, corroborated my statement in the *World* a year before, that so far from having any credit across the ocean, our trade balances were not even sufficient to overcome these annual foreign debts.

During the early part of 1907 there were numerous signs that trouble was brewing, although the financial oracles were doing a tremendous amount of lying to hide the fact from the public. The first was the rapid rise in foreign exchange, and the second was the frantic effort of the big bankers to sell or pledge more securities abroad to avert gold exports. As before stated, they put out some \$300,000,000 in the first ten weeks, and while it did not prevent the March panic, it was frequently admitted that gold would have gone out sooner but for this. Says the London correspondent of the *Post*, May 25: "It is believed here that New York may escape heavy gold exports after all, by putting out finance bills and resorting again to what Lombard Street calls 'hole-and-corner' borrowing." That same week the *Wall Street Journal* and *Dun's Review* both stated that foreign purchases of securities warded off the threatened outflow of gold. In spite of more of such work the yellow metal went out the next week and continued to go until it precipitated the August panic.

It might indeed be supposed that in view of the enormous increase of our currency since 1896, the outflow of a few millions would not matter. But the great fact which is constantly ignored is that one large portion of this money is in the foreign banks here, while another has been carried off by the aliens. A circumstance which proves that these aliens are making away with our gold is, that despite the great increase in production since 1896, the yellow metal is actually scarcer in hand-to-hand circulation than in was ten years ago. There has been, it

is true, an increased amount in circulation here in New York City, but it is only because of the large amounts put out by the Treasury and the imports of borrowed gold from Europe.

Prior to the recent bank failures and the October panic, we did not feel the effect of the loss of this currency, because the banks have been replacing it, as much as they dare, with securities. Thus in 1904, New York savings banks held less than \$19,000,000 worth of United States bonds, as against \$111,000,000 seven years before. In the same period their security holdings rose from nothing to \$177,000,000. This identical thing has been going on all over the United States, as is proved by enormous expansion of loans. Referring to this matter, the *Wall Street Journal*, November 28, 1906, shows that since 1895 there has been an increase of \$2,500,000,000 in the amount of stocks and bonds held by the banks and trust companies of the United States. This is an expansion of over 160 per cent in the bond reserves of the banks. In the same period the loans of all banks increased from \$4,311,000,000 to \$9,863,000,000. Adding the securities to the loans, it is found that there is now an extension of credit by the banks amounting to \$13,936,000,000, a sum nearly five times as much as the money in circulation, and representing an expansion of over 137 per cent in eleven years. The total expansion of credit by securities held and by loans amounted to over \$8,100,000,000.

That the Wall Street banks have had a hand in this business is clearly shown by the following quotation from the *Times*, July 10, 1904: "Country banks are being gradually educated up to the acceptance of New York Stock Exchange securities as collateral. Many banks now make loans on such collateral, which some years ago would not have accepted it at all. *Where will they be when the pinch comes?*"

Well, the pinch came on October 24, 1907, and the American people had a good chance to see where those banks were. Those that had a legal right to demand thirty days' notice took advantage thereof. Those that had no such right simply slammed their doors in the faces of depositors and refused to pay out a dollar. Even now the public seems to have an imperfect idea of the state of affairs. Apparently it thinks that all this money is

still in the country, whereas a great deal of it has been carried off by the aliens. It has gone to Italy, to Austria, to China, to Japan, and to various other countries.

The extent to which the absorption of our currency by these aliens and by the foreign banks, has drained the country and stripped our own banks of their cash, leaving them with nothing but Stock Exchange securities to do business, is clearly shown by this statement in the financial column of the *Press*, November 21, 1907: "There is no disguising the fact that in the highest quarters the pinch for cash is being felt. Folk are just beginning to realize how extensively our financial fabric has been built up on loans secured by stocks and bonds as collateral. The Morse and Thomas method of buying up one bank with the loans obtained on the stock of another and continuing the process indefinitely has spread extensively through the financial world."

Throughout the whole of 1907, financial leaders and Treasury officials were repeating that the boasts of previous years were sound at the bottom. But any student of the facts as published from time to time could see that conditions were very unsound and that the banking position was liable to break down even before any industrial decline set in. And, as usual, the surest indication of this was the frantic effort to stave off gold exports. According to one foreign authority, the new borrowings for this purpose up to September 11, 1907, aggregated \$150,000,000. Along with the failure in Amsterdam and our own bank difficulties came the announcement of a resumption of gold exports to Germany, October 19. It was said that Dutch liquidation caused this last efflux, but the reports showed that other foreigners bought much more of our securities than the Dutch sold.

Now, there is no doubt that it was this last outflow of gold, small as it was, that precipitated the panic of October 24. This is proved by this statement in the *Wall Street Journal*, October 12, 1907: "After the panics Europe must have received extra inducements from some quarters, for the reports of the *Journal of Commerce* and other papers show that it was foreign capital along with Treasury aid that finally checked the disaster."

Writing of "Foreign Exchange in 1907" in the *Times* "An-

ual Review," January 5, 1908, S. J. Bieber points out it was the refusal of London bankers to take any more American finance bills that was a "contributory cause of the distressing scenes that were witnessed on the New York Stock Exchange during the middle of October."

When our bankers were refused aid by London, they applied to Paris, but there, too, they were rebuffed. This latter refusal led to some recrimination in French banking circles and caused the publication of the following statement from the Finance Minister, Caillaux: "At this writing violent recriminations are being indulged in against the Bank of France for what is called its 'refusal to advance gold to a group of American financiers.' " This has led to a published statement by Minister Caillaux through his *chef de cabinet*: "First, the American Government cables the French Government to inquire if the loan can be obtained; second, the French Government, after consulting with the Bank governors, cables back: 'Yes, if the American Treasury guarantees repayment.' President Roosevelt now replies that this is impossible, that the Bank must accept the bankers as sole guarantee — which was impossible by the Bank's own charter."

This refusal of French bankers to lend money without a guarantee by our Government, along with the refusal of London bankers to help us out, not only precipitated the October panic, but it also disclosed, in a very striking manner, the main cause of that trouble.

If these foreign bankers had based their action upon our unsound monetary system the event would have been heralded far and wide as an unanswerable argument in favor of asset currency. But they did not do anything of the kind. The sole reason they gave was that our foreign debt, based almost entirely upon railroad securities, had assumed such frightful proportions that they did not consider it safe to lend us any more on such collateral without a Government guarantee.

Here we have a flat contradiction, by the very highest authorities, of all this talk about foreign liquidation of American railroad securities. For the past ten years we have been told by financial experts that Europe's holdings of our railroad issues

was in consequence of this liquidation, nothing to what it was before 1893, and that the remittances of interest dues were greatly reduced. But now we learn that Europe's holdings of securities have grown to such dimensions that she refuses to take any more of them.

When I combatted the claims of this foreign liquidation in *THE SEWANEE REVIEW*, and presented facts which showed that instead of such liquidation there had been enormous increase of foreign investments in our railroad securities, my views met with the same chilling reception among financial experts here in New York that was accorded to my letter on the "Creditor Nation" lunacy three years before.

The action of these foreign bankers not only confirms my view as to foreign liquidation, but it also confirms my estimate of these annual foreign debts. It shows that they largely overtop our trade balances, leaving us with a huge deficit to meet every year. During the past ten years the net imports of gold that was not borrowed in 1906-1907, was but little more than the net imports of silver. How then could Europe have paid for all these railroad securities without sending us the cash? Or, to put it in another way, how could we have piled up this enormous debt which staggers Europe, unless it was in settlement of a deficit? Is there any other answer to this question than the one already given?

The panic of October, 1907, was, it is now generally admitted, the greatest financial disaster that ever visited any country; and the fact that it was caused by this enormous foreign debt, should warn the American people that their country is rapidly drifting towards financial slavery. It is time for them to learn that Micawber's philosophy is as true on a large scale as a small one: "Annual income, twenty pounds; annual expenditure, twenty-ought-six; result, misery."

W. H. ALLEN.

Brooklyn, New York.

THE CHILD IN EIGHTEENTH CENTURY LITERATURE

In the great mass of critical comment on eighteenth century literature, in the many studies that have been made of the first, misty, half-wistful out-reachings of Romanticism, there has been a curious neglect of a most interesting phase of this many-sided movement — that of the growing consideration of children and childish interests. It is a development, indeed, which should appeal with especial force to this, our latter-day world. To-day our markets are flooded with books for children and about children; the bookdealer fails or succeeds according to his ability to satisfy the demands of the little folk; the aspiring author turns to a ten-year-old public alike for inspiration and patronage; the current magazines sell in proportion to the number of child stories they can boast. Yet no one has paused to trace this current of widespread interest back to its source, which is, quite naturally and properly, to be found in this same romantic movement which had its slender beginnings well back in the eighteenth century.

Previous to the seventeenth century there seems to have been little or no recognition of childhood's legitimate literary demands. As all literary growth is sequential, it will perhaps be of service to take a rapid survey of conditions leading up to the era of general awakening in the eighteenth century.

In the days of bookish scarcity, when materials were dear, and production laborious, it is natural that no books should have been produced for mere pleasure's sake, and that all which were thus painfully given to the children should have served as manuals of instruction, both intellectual and moral. The books of the time, then, fall easily into two classes: (1) books of good counsel; and (2) classical grammars. The former we find, as we might expect, stern and unsympathetic, all written from the lamentably grown-up standpoint expressed in Henry Scogan's lines:

That tyme loste in youthhed jolity,
Greveth a wight bodily and ghostly.

From "The Babees Booke," the reprinting of which is far from being the least of Dr. Furnival's many valuable contributions to literary study, we quote the following "good counsel" for the guidance and edification of the hapless children of long ago:

For as the wise man sayeth and proveth,
A lere child, lore he behoveth;
And as men say that be ler(n)ed,
He hateth the child that spareth the yerde;
And as the wise man saith in his book
Of proverbs and wisdoms,—who will look,—
As a sharp spur maketh a horse to run
Under a man that should war win,
Right so a yerde may make a child
To learn his lessons and to be mild.

The same book, however, proves that even in those dark days there was an occasional gleam of humorous and appreciative understanding. A schoolboy has played truant — as what healthy schoolboy of any date would not, under the above quoted provocation? — has been caught, and in consequence flogged. Therefore, he gives voice, through the medium of a really delightful poem, to many a disrespectful and relentless wish, the final one being altogether too choice to escape frequent quotation, representing as it does, the universal emotions of the universal schoolboy:

I wolde my master were an hare
And all his bookes houndes were,
And I myselfe a Joly hontere;
To blow my horn I wolde not spare,
For if he were dead I wolde not care
What Vayleth me, though I say nay?

About this time, however, as if to show a more cheerful obverse to the period, we find an attempt to alleviate youthful miseries by the introduction of jingling rhymes to facilitate memorization of that eternal bugbear, the Latin grammar. Very likely the rhymes added grateful relish to the dry task. We may be sure, however, that they added nothing to the student's poetical appreciation.

In the Elizabethan Era we find a single writer, who seems to have written with the distinct purpose of reaching childish un-

derstanding. It was Edward Coote, who, though from the modern standpoint, most unpedagogical in method, was still a writer of considerable boyish appeal, as the following lines bear witness:

My child and scholar, take goode heede
Unto the words that here are set,
And see thou do accordingly
Or else be sure thou shall be beat!

As for the rest, in the abundant poetic outpouring of Shakespeare's time, we find no trace of the real boy or girl. There was, it is true, an occasional baby song of rare beauty, such as gentle, melancholy Nicholas Breton gives us in his much disputed "Lullaby," or such as Greene writes under the title of "Sephestia's Song to Her Child;" but we at once recognize these poems merely as convenient vehicles for expressing adult emotions and in no sense inspired by or written for His Majesty the Baby. In the lovable, vital childishness of the period, the child himself had no place. The sixteenth century world was made for lords and ladies, Corydons and Phillydas, Dicks and Joans; but not for rollicking youngsters with their large demands and generous bestowals of hearty life and love. Whenever a feeble attempt was made to picture childhood, the weazened, drawfed little men and women who resulted were indeed pathetic, even when they grew under the master pen of our master Shakespeare, in whose myriad minds there seems to have been no spymathetic comprehension of childhood.

Not only was there no literature in which children figured, but there was none for them. Instead of the psychologic public of to-day which so vigilantly studies childish tastes, and so thoughtfully sugar-coats each bit of knowledge recalcitrant youth must swallow, there was a care-free, conscienceless world of grown-ups, who said to their children, "Don't read, but if read you must, here are a Latin grammar and a Greek lexicon." And with them the sturdy schoolboy had to be content, after he had passed the preliminary coaching of the dame school and the horn book, both of which, we dare to conjecture, were vastly less interesting to him than they are to the student of to-day.

The seventeenth century was as barren in its child literature

as it was in all other respects, and accountably so. It was the era of the Puritan, in whose gloomy conception every irresponsible babe born into the world was inevitably damned and was to be saved from a perpetuation of this mournful fate only by a life of the most rigorous self-abasement and self-denial. One of the best exponents of the age is James Janeway, of unhappy memory, author of "A Looking Glass for Children," and "Tokens for Children," this latter further announcing itself as "An exact account of the conversion, holy and exemplary lives, and joyful deaths of several young children." Attractive enough, is it not? And further investigation convinces us that any of its youthful readers must have preferred eternal gloom to instant salvation of the pale and sickly order portrayed. Yet it was a case of "Take this book or go without." Poor, poor children! The saddest part of the story is that they, too, grew up in the same humorless mould, and for two generations afflicted their children, even as they themselves had been afflicted.

It was this century which produced the ascetic allegory of that Christian visionary, John Bunyan. Not that he wrote for children, but children then and thereafter claimed as their own, a book which attracted them partly through its allegorical medium, and partly through its vivid concrete delineation. One book of verse Bunyan did write, avowedly for young folks, giving it the alarming title of "Divine Emblems, or Temporal Things Spiritualized for the Use of Boys and Girls." In its ludicrous ignorance of the form and content of poetry — in which field, to do him justice, Bunyan makes no claim to proficiency — it affords the only gleam of fun and humor which makes its way through the Puritanic gloom of the century, whose attitude towards its children is well indicated by the title *Nolens Volens*, which Elisha Coles (1640-1680) gives to his Latin Grammar.

With such antecedents, then, the eventful eighteenth century was ushered in, bringing with it, for the first time, a very acceptable glimpse of a sturdy childhood, which sprang up perforce to counteract with its healthy vigor the immorality and artificiality of its contemporary adult period, and to bring sweet, untainted freshness to the early dawn of a new era. Literary activity in behalf of the children was still in control of those who

felt the responsibility of their moral welfare, and we are no whit surprised to find in the lead of the van that most pleasing divine, the brightest "among numerous stars which have adorned the hemisphere of the Christian Church," the very reverend Dr. Watts. Having passed through a most exemplary childhood himself, demanding books before he could talk plainly, studying Latin at the age of four, and shortly thereafter writing Latin pindarics to his teacher, who, pray, had a better right to preach to children? Preach he did, and very acceptably, it would seem. In 1706 he published his *Horæ Lyricæ*, which is known to-day chiefly as the volume which contains the famous warning to the young, "Remember Your Creator." The poem is full of the forceful morality which is aptly expressed by the definitely marked rhythm of this writer of hymns. The first venture was a good one. Idolized by all non-conformists, and urged on by his own restless conscience, he produced his emotional hymns and remarkable Hebrew paraphrases, all in preparation of the first book really to be devoted to children. In 1719, finally, were written the "Divine and Moral Songs for Children." By them, Dr. Watts has been and will be remembered. The book is prefaced by some remarkably unique and impersonal remarks about his own poetry. For instance, he writes: "There is delight in the very learning of truth and duties in this way. There is something so amusing and entertaining in rhymes and meter that will incline children to make this part of their business a diversion. And you may turn their very duty into a reward [so unwise was the learned gentleman in his methods!] by giving them the privilege of learning one of these songs a week if they fulfill the business of the week well, and promising them the book itself, when they have learned ten or twenty songs of it."

However far the good doctor may be from the ideals of the children of to-day, he was the first consciously to seek their level in his own time. "And as I have endeavored," he continues, "to sink the language to the level of a child's understanding, and yet to keep it, if possible, above contempt, so I have designed to profit all, if possible, and offend none." That he deemed himself successful in this laudable undertaking is

evident from the complacent tone in which he later speaks of "these my little composures!"

The verses, themselves, simple and by no means unworthy, are full of delicious and wholly unconscious humor, and their sentiments are fearlessly and ruthlessly expressed with the fervor of a man who preaches well and knows it, and loves the knowledge. The poet scourges vice and exposes shame and scoffs at weakness with all the cheerful vigor of the reformer, bent on the redemption of another's soul. Listen! all ye worldly-minded little girls of to-day!

Why should our garments (made to hide
Our parents' shame) provoke our pride?
The art of dress did ne'er begin
Till Eve; our mother, learned to sin.

How proud we are, how fond to show
Our clothes, and call them rich or new;
When the poor sheep and silk-worm wore
That very clothing long before.

The tulip and the butterfly
Appear in gayer coats than I;
Let me be dressed fine as I will,
Flies, worms, and flowers exceed me still.

Forestalling Oliver Herford and his "Natural History Primer" by nearly two hundred years, Dr. Watts often turns to animals and insects to point his moral lessons. In "The Ant or Emmet," he preserves in doggerel an anapestic measure which his contemporary, Matthew Prior, had a few years earlier made famous in a far different strain. What sombre reflections must this poem have induced in its youthful readers!

Now, now while my strength and my youth are in bloom,
Let me think what shall serve me when sickness shall come,
And pray that my sins be forgiven;
Let me read in good books, and believe and obey,
That when death turns me out of this cottage of clay,
I may dwell in a palace in Heaven!

In the same tripping meter is a hymn even more humorously severe. We all know it:

'Tis the voice of the sluggard, I hear him complain,
You have waked me too soon, I must slumber again.

And as a result of this sloth, follow evils upon evils until

Said I then to my heart, "Here's a lesson for me;
The man's but a picture of what I might be!"

But the dismal thought is finally dissipated by the reflection:

Thanks to my friends for their care in my breeding
Who have taught me betimes to love working and reading.

Is it any wonder that Dr. Johnson, who was never a boy himself, strongly approved of Dr. Watts and declared that any one "who has the care of instructing others may be charged with deficiency in his duty" (note the pompous threat of the words!) "if Dr. Watts be not recommended."

The book is redeemed from a purely humorous aspect in our own more irreligious age, by an occasional stanza of real lyricism and unaffected emotion. There is no more tender cradle hymn than the lovely stanzas beginning, "Hush, my dear, lie still and slumber." With this and a few other verses in mind, it might be a curious and profitable bit of literary labor to read Dr. Watts with an eye to establishing the literary ancestry of some of Wordsworth's simpler verses. It certainly takes very little critical acumen to discern in the independent spirit and untrammelled expression of the slender volume, the germs of that Romanticism which burst into brilliant blossom under the tendance of the Lake Poets.

In amusing contrast to the reverend doctor, we find worldly-minded Matt Prior, who was writing contemporaneously his delightful lyrics and *vers de société* to the noble children of his acquaintance. A not-too-moral trifler in a not-too-moral age, a bit of a scheming politician, very much a hanger-on of the rich and influential men of his time, a poetical forerunner of Keats, a Hudibrastic satirist, a brilliant writer of most perfect society verse — so is Prior known. He would be known much more happily and worthily if his readers would do him the justice to read his few charming poems for children, sympathetic, loving, lovable as they are. His first attempt in this field was in the "Lines to My Young Lord Buckhurst, Playing with a Cat." The verses are thoroughly poetic, though not so good perhaps,

as those to "A Child of Quality, Five Years Old." The poem is exquisite and marks Prior, more surely than any of his other works, as worthy of lasting favor.

"To Lady Margaret Cavendish, When a Child," is another of Prior's good child poems which merits wider recognition than it has usually received:

My noble, lovely, little Peggy,
Let this my first epistle, beg ye,
At dawn of morn and close of even,
To lift your head and hands to heaven.
In double duty say your prayer,
Our Father first,— then *notre pere*.

And dearest child, along the day,
In everything you do or say,
Obey and please my Lord and Lady,
So God shall love and angels aid ye.
If to these precepts ye attend,
No second letter need I send,
And so I rest, your constant friend.

The tribute to the noble, lovely, little Peggy shows her capable not only of inspiring a notable poet to write a notable poem, but also of pricking deep with youthful charms, below the mask of the languid scoffer which Prior habitually wore, and drawing from him a bit of preaching as serious, if not as violent, as Dr. Watts would have written, and one far more aglow with gentle tenderness.

In very different humor he wrote "The Female Phæton," which recommends itself both to the student of the eighteenth century and the lover of children. The poem was written for Lady Catherine Hyde, and pictures her, a little girl, grieving — as what younger sister has not grieved? — over the fact that her older sister is accorded social privileges and triumphs which are not allowed her.

With lines of such whim, social and appreciative insight in mind, it becomes a question, not to be lightly answered, whether Prior did not do quite as much for the child world as did denunciatory Isaac Watts, with his blood-chilling sermons. However we may answer the question, we must at least conclude that

through these so different channels came contributions to the same slowly growing stream of independent, natural thought, which was moving farther and farther away from the artificial classicism of the Popeian school.

Better known than Prior, and less deserving of recognition, is John Gay, who can claim attention here only through a scant handful of verses addressed to the young folks of his acquaintance. Saintsbury, with his usual satiric appreciation and apt epithet, has characterized him as "a human lap-dog," and though he met easy toleration in his own day, as indeed in this, and made many faithful friends, yet we find him so much occupied with his attempt to swim with the current, that we expect little divergence from the accepted and popular poetic standards of his immediate age. Nor do we find it. His few accidental verses for children are in the prevailing heroic couplet, and show no signs in thought or form of the slowly growing classical revolt. Perhaps the best he has to contribute, aside from two or three stereotyped fables "to young noblemen," is the poem "To a Young Lady, With Some Lamphreys," which expresses at once his pleasant cleverness and his habitual impecuniosity. The poem, in its smooth formality and superficial mode of thought, serves well as a contrasting background for the real child literature that was being quietly and unobtrusively developed.

Writing contemporaneously, and in the same artificial strain, yet with a childish simplicity and grace which should have won him more credit, was Ambrose Philips, who is unkindly said to have surpassed his contemporaries in one respect only — that of longevity! From his name, Henry Carey, famous as the author of "Sally in Our Alley" and his one immortal epithet, derived the adjective "Namby-Pamby." Apart from a few delicate juvenile poems, fettered by conventional form, it must be admitted that Philips proved worthy of the word; but, curiously enough, it was these same juvenile poems which our later criticism admits as worthy, that gave origin to the derisive epithet. It was fastened inevitably upon him by Pope, to whom a contemptuous epithet gave more pleasure than anything else, except personal adulation. In any case, Philips certainly merits praise

for graceful verses like those "To Miss Georgiana Carteret."

The lines, though artificial in form, are yet more genuine in thought, and therefore more worthy than those of their censor, Pope, in whose "Rape of the Lock" we find a poem written "only to divert a few young ladies," and taking young folks as its subject. But alas! for the vigorous sermons of Dr. Watts and the morality they were intended to engender. The poem, in its thin shrillness, its lack of genuine feeling and sincere emotion, its unblushing exposure of human vanities, is a typical product, not only of its writer but of its age. It is the work of a man, who, according to M. Taine, "never wrote because he thought, but thought in order to write," and he might have added, never thought at all, except in bitterness. It was the work of an age which stood sponsor for the almost insane development of the artificial couplet. For us in the discussion of our present topic it has only backgrown signification, affording a contrast for the greater illustration of the scattering attempts that were beginning to show genuine childhood in a true light. So considering it, we find it witty, epigrammatic, ingenious — never ingenuous — brilliantly and often maliciously satirical, and silvery sweet in its delicate fantasy. Better than any other product of the age it shows by its artificial treatment of free young life what the rebellious romanticists had to work against.

Omitting the rather entertaining though not very meritorious juvenile poems of the mad poet, Christopher Smart, we find in the middle century, the reading world enraptured with "the first real prose novels," which in their huge bulk and wearisome detail seem to a modern reader both "real" and "prosaic" with a vengeance. However, they shed a somewhat amusing side-light on our present topic in illustration of which I quote from Mr. Wilbur L. Cross's "Development of the English Novel:"

"It was customary in Richardson's time to read his novels aloud in the family circle. When some pathetic passage was reached, the members of the family would retire to separate apartments to weep; and after composing themselves they would return to the fireside to hear the reading proceed. It was reported to Richardson once that on one of these occasions 'an

amiable little boy' sobbed as if his little sides would burst, and resolved to mind his books, that he might be able to read 'Pamela' through without stopping. That there might be something in the family novel expressly for children, Richardson sometimes stepped aside from his narrative — unity of construction was always happily ignored in his novels — to tell them a moral tale. Here are two companion pieces, clipped of their decorations. There were once two little boys and two little girls, who never told fibs, who were never rude, noisy, mischievous nor quarrelsome; who always said their prayers before going to bed and as soon as they arose. They grew up. The masters became fine gentlemen; and the misses became fine ladies and housewives. There were once three naughty boys who had a naughty sister. They were always quarrelling and scratching and would not say their prayers. They, too, grew up. One of the boys was drowned at sea, and the second turned thief, and the third was forced to beg his bread in a far country. And the naughty girl fell from a tree and broke her arm and died of a fever."

This combination of a moral lesson and a pleasure book found huge favor in the eyes of the children and their directors, with the result that the floodgates of child literature were opened and we get a very noticeably increased number of children's books rapidly put into circulation. In their patronizing spirit and obvious morality our happy children and theorizing parents of to-day would find insuperable objections. That they were acceptable in their own day is an incontrovertible — if to us an inexplicable — fact, to which their remarkable increase bears sufficient testimony. Among the most notable writers of these moral tales we find one Thomas Day, whose name is familiar to many of us as the pious author of "Sanford and Merton," a book of prudential and egoistic morality beyond comment. Benevolent and possessed of a fortune to make benevolence practical, Mr. Day spent his early life in study, continental travel, and philanthropic investigation and giving. Returning to England, he spent several years "in a search for a suitable partner in life." Having found one to his liking and having been rudely jilted by her, he fell into a pronounced disaffection for fashionable society, and applied himself to writing a book which should

give expression to his "spleen." Rightfully assuming that one must make appeal to the rising generation if any reform is to be accomplished, Mr. Day addressed himself in "Sanford and Merton" to the children, and in the person of his own Mr. Barrow, he delivers pompous opinions, and gives forth moral precepts of impressive weight and dignity. The book was characterized in its own generation, as "a book replete with information, and of unimpeachable morality." Both statements are undoubtedly true. We can understand, also, how it must have served its purpose of salving the wounded pride and dignity of the rejected lover. It is less easy to appreciate the source of its fascination for healthy children, who, to a large degree unmoral in their early years, have yet a voracious appetite for tangible and concrete morality in their story-books. At any rate, the book was successful in its day, and has remained so through several succeeding generations; the present writer, herself, having a grateful recollection of many fascinated hours spent in its irreproachable company. For the satisfaction of the curious we may add that the author did not remain in his condition of social animosity, but, after having tried some interesting experiments in the effort suitably to mate himself, he married — so happily as to restore his social equilibrium — a wife whose conduct at his death attests her devotion. We are told that after her husband's decease, Mrs. Day never again looked upon the sun, but lay in a bed whose curtains were never drawn, and walked in her garden only at night. Our biographer adds naively that several years later she died of a broken heart.

Much influenced by Mr. Day was another writer for children, Miss Maria Edgeworth, whose father was a constant and devoted companion of the author of "Sanford and Merton." Choosing subjects equally lugubrious and "moral," Miss Edgeworth wrote several books of "Moral Tales" and "Popular Tales" for little children, their principal departure from earlier attempts being in their conversational form and in their laudable efforts to use a vocabulary natural and comprehensible to her readers. Hers was the most successful "primer" work done in the latter years of the eighteenth and first years of the nineteenth century; and while we can only gasp in bewilderment over some of her

discussions of death and eternity and original sin, we can and do recognize her effort — as yet unusual — to study the capacity and intellectual range of the children for whom she wrote.

Mrs. Barbauld — now known only for her famous apostrophe to "Life" — was attempting, less successfully, similar work, as also was Hannah More in her more advanced "Essays for Young Ladies." In other words, the eyes of the closing century were opened to the legitimate demands of the children for suitable books, and the seeds sown so long since by Dr. Watts were coming to their tardy fruition.

A yet more healthy phase of this element of the Romantic development was represented first by John Newberry of blessed memory, and later by Charles and Mary Lamb. Upon the work of Newberry, the children's publisher, who devoted himself to putting upon the market such delectable classics as "Goody-Two-Shoes," we must refrain from comment, since his contribution to this and other literary fields is of too great significance to allow compression into so brief a sketch. Suffice it to say that his seems to be the most natural and appreciative understanding of children that the century produced, and that his efforts to propagate healthful juvenile literature should enhalo him in the minds of happy children and their lovers.

It is much easier to speak of the limited contributions to our subject made by the gentle Elia — "that good Samaritan turned humorist" — and in his work in the first years of the new century we find the best justification of the struggle of the old. We read of his writing in "righteous rage" to Coleridge about "Mrs. Barbauld's and Mrs. Trimmer's nonsense." Let us quote his own indignant words: "Knowledge, insignificant and vapid as Mrs. Barbauld's books convey, must, it seems, come to a child in the shape of knowledge, and his empty noddle must be turned with conceit of his own powers when he has learned that a horse is an animal, and that Billy is better than a horse, and such like; instead of that beautiful interest in wild tales which made the child a man, while all the time he suspected himself to be no bigger than a child."

Acting upon the positive theory suggested in his vigorous denunciation, he proceeded to write in 1806, in conjunction with

his sister Mary, a very delightful little book for children called "Mrs. Leicester's School." This he followed in 1827 with the "Tales From Shakespeare." The books, as everyone knows, are to the full, as gentle-spirited and human-hearted as are his essays for adults; and in them we find for the first time, literature for children placed upon its proper level of dignity and simplicity and childishness. It appears not too difficult to connect this slow growth throughout the eighteenth century with the generally recognized Romantic movement, which consists, after all, in nothing more than a recognition of genuine sentiment as opposed to superficial technicality. "Man is a point that flies with two wings: one is thought; the other, love," says Victor Hugo. The Elizabethans were crippled because their flight was winged by love alone; the Augustans, because they poised on thought alone. It was the work of Romanticism to equalize and harmonize the two, and hence to perfect the flight of the spirit. This equalization resulted in a restrained communism which recognized at once the power of the individual egoist and the rights and worth of altruistic demands. So we have a new spirit of liberty, a new sense of brotherhood, a reverence for democratic ideals, an awakening love of nature, an assimilation of the literature of other nations — Gaelic or Norse or what not, all springing from the addition of natural sentiment to the polished intellect of the earlier decades. "Love, and do, it matters not what," writes St. Augustine. And it seems a most natural result that this growing sentiment for sincerity and charity and open-heartedness in politics and thought and life should find instinctive expression in increased care for and service to the *little* children of men.

So the eighteenth century, with its tentative, uncertain, half-timid efforts, led the way to the nineteenth century, which centered its best thought and tenderest care around its young, believing with the Master of old, that a little child shall lead, even in things literary. Without Dr. Watts, Thomas Day, and Maria Edgeworth, in spite of the ludicrous aspect their works sometimes assume, there could not have been the stirring novels and romances of Scott, which have delighted the hearts of so many school-boys and girls. "I just love his romantics," ex-

claimed one of the latter. So do we all. Nor are we ashamed to own it, because it is to dear, genial Sir Walter that we pay our tribute, in the pleasant knowledge that he never did and never can grow up and away from his lovable, enthusiastic, breathless boyishness! Who shall say that the modern world's psychologic and literary turning to its boys and girls has not done, and will not do, more than any other existing tendency to point the way we are so blindly seeking to the "hidden country of the Heart's Desire," where "the hand of the Lord shall wipe away the tears from all the faces?"

WINIFRED SNOW.

Richmond Hill, Long Island.

REVIEWS

THE NORTH ITALIAN PAINTERS OF THE RENAISSANCE

THE NORTH ITALIAN PAINTERS OF THE RENAISSANCE. By Bernard Berenson. New York: G. P. Putnam & Sons.

This is the completion of one of the most important achievements in art criticism — perhaps the most important since the publication of Crowe and Cavalcasselle's monumental work. It is probable that Mr. Berenson knows more about Italian painting than any living man, and in these four slender volumes, covering the Venetian, the Florentine, the Central and the North Italian schools, he has undertaken to compress the substance of all his knowledge. They are marvelous books, containing in a narrow compass the fruits of a life of labor, of labor so intense that at one time it threatened to shatter the author's health forever. No one interested in Italian art can afford to ignore these volumes. In fact, owing to their extreme condensation, their full import cannot be realized at a single reading, and the student of Italian painting should return to them again and again.

Their brevity has its advantage not merely for the reader, but for Mr. Berenson himself. They are too short to permit him to exhibit his chief fault as an art-critic, an overweening confidence in his own opinions. His judgment as to the authorship of Italian pictures is probably worth more than that of any man who has ever lived; but in his critical articles it is pronounced with an assurance that is amazing and at times exasperating. Where all that a more modest critic will venture to say is that a certain picture is the work of a given school, all of whose members paint much alike, Mr. Berenson will unhesitatingly assign it to a particular artist and most likely to a particular decade of his life. He may be right in these bold attributions. Documents since discovered have justified some of them, and so far as I know, none have been thoroughly discredited; but to any ordinary person he often seems to state as unquestionable facts views which should be advanced as mere conjectures. This fault, if fault it be, is apparent in these volumes only in the lists of pic-

tures in the appendix. You will look there in vain for many a work generally assigned to a favorite master; and you will find attributed to him some pictures that you had never suspected to be his. Still the lists are probably the best to be had anywhere, and they are certainly most convenient.

It seems to me that Mr. Berenson does not sufficiently emphasize the importance of color. His three essential elements in painting are "tactile values," by which he means a realistic presentation that makes us feel that we could handle the figures; "space-composition," or the relation of the figures to one another in space, so that they may not, like those of the Egyptians, all seem to be on one plane; and movement, in which he includes the evident power to move in figures that are at rest. These qualities imply mastery of drawing and of light and shade; but beauty and appropriateness of color seem to me equally essential. Indeed, in the conclusion of this volume, Mr. Berenson confesses that he has sinned in ignoring color, and expresses the hope that he may live to rewrite his work on the Venetians, so as to give to color a more prominent place.

This volume is the least important and the least interesting of the four; for, somewhat unwisely, as it seems to me, Mr. Berenson treated the man who dominated the painting of Northern Italy and formed its principal school, Leonardo da Vinci, in the one on Florence. This leaves no artists of the greatest rank save Mantegna and Correggio, so that the book is mostly concerned with men of the second or lower grade.

In one respect he seems to me grievously at fault, and that is in the slight esteem in which he holds Francesco Francia. This is perhaps due to his historical bias. Francia was not the originator of any movement nor the founder of any school, whose influence can be traced through a multitude of pupils; and so he has less merit in Mr. Berenson's eyes than the hard and unpleasant Tura. Yet, he is one of the most satisfying of all artists. Sweetness and beauty and serenity are his in richest measure. His works are a joy forever. They are among the things with which one loves to live, on which one would delight to fix his glazing eye. They have the merits of Perugino and Raphael, though of course they do not reach the impeccable artistry of

the Prince of Painters. Mr. Berenson admits the charm of the "Madonna of the Rose Hedge," at Munich; but he has no word of praise for the "Pieta," of the National Gallery, that supremely touching and beautiful work; nor for the "Annunciation," of the Brera, with its uplifting sense of space and its quiet dignity; nor for the "Descent from the Cross," at Parma, whose far-reaching landscape is one of the most delightful things in Renaissance art. In fact, it seems to me, as it seems to most lovers of painting, that Francia holds a place second only to the greatest; and the low opinion which Mr. Berenson expresses of his achievement must raise a protest in many bosoms.

He is equally unjust to the immediate followers of Leonardo, to Luini, Il Sodoma, Solario, Gaudenzio Ferrari and Boltraffio, though he concedes a certain merit to Gaudenzio, because his rugged genius failed to assimilate entirely the teachings of the master.

Yet this school of Leonardo's is one of the most delightful things in all the range of art. It is true that they did not sound the depths nor climb the heights that Leonardo reached. No one could doubt that. But they give us in a high degree one element of his genius, the sweetness of his female faces.

Luini's types may, as Mr. Berenson says, lack variety. The same exquisite smile may play around too many lips. His countenances may present too uniformly the same lovely oval. But those beautiful faces, faultless in their contours and irradiated by that smile that approaches closer than any other to the fathomless smile of Leonardo, are possessions of purest joy.

It is true that Il Sodoma painted some works that are feeble—what artist has not?—but his "St. Sebastian" is the most beautiful youth that modern art has given us, lacking something of the wholesome vigor of the Greek ideal, but so exquisite in his slender proportions and in the refinement of his countenance that he makes an irresistible appeal to every beholder. The "Ecstasy" and the "Swooning" of St. Catherine, at Siena, are also among the most exquisite creations of the brush, delightful in their soft color and unsurpassable in their delicacy. And

what is there more touching than his "Christ Bound to the Column?" With the unerring instinct of genius, Sodoma does not show us the flagellation, but its effects. When we see in thousands of other pictures the thongs whistling through the air and tearing the quivering flesh, it makes no such impression. Perchance when the brutal scene is over Christ will resume his calm. Il Sodoma shows us the Man of Sorrows when body and mind are alike broken by pain; and the bruised and bleeding Christ who leans exhausted against that column is the most pitiful thing in all the range of art. The only thing that approaches it is Le Brun's fearful drawing of the Duchess of Brinvilliers after the torture; and there our pity is checked by the consciousness of her unspeakable crimes.

Mr. Berenson admits that Solario's "Madonna of the Green Cushion" has still a charm for him, but he treats this as a survival of the weakness of his youth. But Solario painted many pictures of almost equal loveliness, and his landscape backgrounds alone should save him from condemnation; just as the enchanting glimpse of mountain and river seen through the window of Ferrari's "St. Paul," in the Louvre, should alone suffice for his fame. And as for Boltraffio, that wonderful head of a youth in the Uffizi, where the sweet melancholy of Antinoüs is revived in a face still more beautiful, should shield him from too harsh a censure.

In fact, Mr. Berenson's artistic standards are too severe. Only the qualities that he calls "life enhancing," the qualities of vigorous presentation which make a picture seem more real than nature, appeal to him. He does not sufficiently appreciate sweetness and grace, delicacy and charm. He even despises emotion and the too evident expression of the feelings. The elements that he seeks are worthy of all honor—they are perhaps the highest that a work of art can possess. But they are not the whole; and the qualities which he despises are those which most effectively perform one of art's highest functions—consolation. As Schopenhauer long since discovered, art is the great consoler. In its presence we forget our griefs, our disappointments, the weariness of life. It bears us away into the realm of the imagination, and causes us to forget the sordid or

bitter realities that make a burden of existence; and there is many a picture that would not measure up to Mr. Berenson's severe standards, which yet admirably performs this function.

GEORGE B. ROSE.

THE 1907 BAMPTON LECTURES

THE REPROACH OF THE GOSPEL. Being the 1907 *Bampton Lectures*. By J. H. F. Peile. New York: Longmans, Green & Company. 1907.

Mr. Peile's Bampton Lectures, or Bampton *Sermons* as they should be called, are quite remarkable. Not because they give evidence of profound learning, since as a matter of fact almost every noticeable statement in the book is enclosed in quotation marks, but because they are honest and earnest discourses upon the much neglected fundamentals of life. Perhaps the best key to the author's purpose is on page 192, where he says:

"It was my deliberate purpose to raise more questions than I can answer, in the hope of getting some of them answered by wiser and better people than myself. . . . I desire to make people . . . discontented . . . and I shall have succeeded so far, if my words help . . . in bringing the fine intellect and character of Oxford to the solution of the riddles which perplex and threaten us."

We all feel that these lectures would be of great value if they awaken some prophet to tell us in the next series how the "Reproach of the Gospel" is to be wiped away.

Specifically, the first two lectures are weak; they confuse one by attempting too much and leaving much unsaid. The third lecture is not convincing, and the fourth is barely suggestive. But when we come to the last four we enter more fertile fields and discover at last the writer's ability. In the fourth lecture, on "Social Questions," we find many things well said; and obtain generally an healthy and vigorous view of the modern sociological situation. We are worried by no rhetorical panaceas, nor does the writer confuse us by Utopian platitudes. He simply gives us a clear diagnosis of the whole disease politic, brushing aside symptoms and directing our attention to the real root of the trouble. Which metaphor reminds us of a similar one used

by him upon the same subject. Speaking of the inadequacy of modern Christianity, he compares our "mild and manageable form of fever" to that "which consumed St. Paul, and wrung from him the agonized cry, 'Wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death'" (page 156). It is the very mildness of our religious fever or fervour which Mr. Peile shows to be the whole trouble with "Christian Civilization."

In addition to the filtered and feeble Christianity of the day we are shown still deeper trouble, in that as a result of it the present point of view of the so-called civilized world is utterly subversive to the ideals of Christ. Whereas, the poverty that needs pity is spiritual poverty, we have come to think that the most pitiable condition into which a man can fall is material poverty. Resulting from this, gold has become our criterion of everything, and our bowels of mercy have been infected until a typhoid has set in, and our good deeds are no longer good deeds, but rather are mistaken and dangerous. It is with trenchant clearness that Mr. Peile exposes this (see pages 107 ff) 'devaluation,' and we only hope that the theme will be taken up in similar spirit and preached broadcast.

So far as solutions to the problems are concerned, our author shows great vision in not prophesying. The whole trouble with the social question is that men, the men competent to deal with it, are busied with prophesying for the future, and fail to realize that it is to-day that we need to do something, rather than plan something for to-morrow.

A. R. GRAY.

ENGLISH POETRY

ENGLISH POETRY (1170-1892). Selected and edited by John Matthews Manly, Ph.D. Ginn & Company.

Almost every teacher of English finds it difficult to arouse in the average college freshman or college sophomore a genuine and abiding interest in poetry, or to create in him an honest appreciation and enjoyment of the best literature. Most of the textbooks recently edited for classes in English literature are prepared by specialists solely from the scholar's point of view, and

are too often burdened with a mass of critical apparatus enough to spoil the appetite of the most voracious reader at the very outset. It is a pleasure, then, to find a scholar who is sufficiently bold to strike out in a new path, and who publishes a comprehensive collection of English poems from 1170 to 1892, omitting long introductory remarks and learned annotations.

"The idea and plan of the present volume," says the editor in his preface (p. iv), "originated ten years ago, when Professor Bronson, Professor Dodge and I were engaged in giving an introductory course in English literature to a class of one hundred and forty freshmen and sophomores in Brown University. We found that we secured the best results by having the students read as widely as their time permitted and then discussing freely with them such points as seemed vital to the interest or the significance of the literature read. We proceeded on the theory that literary productions are vital, organic wholes, and that they must be treated as such to produce the effects intended by their authors. Special beauties of detail were noted and enjoyed, but were subordinated to the main meaning and beauty, unless, indeed, as sometimes occurred, the significance of the piece we were reading lay in the beauty of its details, in the nature of its ornamentation, rather than in the meaning or form as a whole. Questions of structure and relations of parts were discussed, but with a view primarily to the main theme. Lectures on the authors were given, but the greater part of each lecture was devoted to trying to show what the author meant by his work, what he wished to say, what was significant or interesting in his special way of saying it, and why it was or was not of permanent value. Dates and facts and groups of names were given and required to be learned, but not without an attempt to express their significance in such terms of human experience as had actuality for the students themselves.

"That the interest and intelligent co-operation of every member of the class were gained by this method, I will not pretend; but I can testify that I have never seen better results from any class or a larger proportion of interested and intelligent listeners in any audience."

Such a plan of teaching required a very large range of reading

material, and so the editor decided to "collect into a single volume all the pieces of non-dramatic poetry that any teacher would likely care to have at hand from which to make his own selections. . . . I hope it will be of service to teachers who believe, with me, that the love of reading and the habit of it are best awakened by treating pieces of literature as living, organic wholes and by subordinating all other considerations to this during the student's first introduction to the study of literature. It may also be useful to that large group of teachers who believe, as I do, that however small may be the number of poems that time permits one to read with his class, they should be chosen by the teacher himself with special reference to the taste and mental development of the pupils he actually has to deal with in each class."

With such comprehensive scope, the collection is naturally very large, and the book is rather bulky, covering nearly six hundred pages and measuring $6\frac{1}{2} \times 8\frac{3}{4} \times 1\frac{3}{8}$. The Introduction, comprising only about twenty pages (pp. xxvii-xxviii), contains brief, critical estimates of the authors and poems. The editing of the different texts is done with care and accuracy. Though the apparently endless mass of material, the necessarily small type, and the double columns of print are not likely to prove altogether attractive to the student at first sight, many teachers should find the volume exceedingly useful on the reference shelf, and those who are ready to adopt or have adopted Professor Manly's excellent method of instruction, will find the collection almost indispensable in the class-room.

JOHN M. MCBRYDE, JR.

NOTES

If the work of historical and patriotic societies has often been open to criticism in respect to emphasis of details and limitation to local horizons, there are encouraging signs of change. Of most promise, perhaps, is the devotion of funds to the collection and reprinting of documents of real historic importance; of which a very noteworthy example is afforded in the recent enterprise of the National Society of the Colonial Dames of America, which has resulted in the publication in two handsome volumes of "The Correspondence of William Pitt, when Secretary of State, with Colonial Governors and Military and Naval Commissioners in America" (The Macmillan Co., 1906). Having appropriated the necessary funds, the Colonial Dames found a wise counsellor in Dr. J. F. Jameson, Director of the Department of Historical Research in the Carnegie Institution of Washington, who suggested the field in which their activity might be employed, and chose for the editorship of the work, Miss Gertrude Selwyn Kimball.

The letters selected for reprinting in these volumes are nearly five hundred in number of which only sixty-eight, the editor informs us, have ever been printed before. One hundred and twenty-seven are written by Pitt, one hundred and seventy are those of Colonial Governors to Pitt, and the remainder are communications to Pitt from military and naval officers. The years covered by the correspondence are those of his secretaryship in the Southern Department, 1756-1761 — years of the deepest importance and of the most stirring interest in the history of England as well as that of the American Colonies. In the course of the correspondence one meets familiar names: Loudoun, Pownall, Dinwiddie, Sharpe, Lyttelton, Dobbs, Abercrombie, Amherst, Wolfe, Forbes. The official character of the letters does not obscure the dramatic character of the events that were brought by the passing months, or the personalities of the various writers, and in particular, that of the master mind in whose plans these events and personalities were the mechanism of victory.

The documents are copied from the series "Colonial Papers, America and West Indies," and the Chatham (Pringle) Mss. in the British Public Record Office. The editor's introduction and notes leave, in general, nothing to be desired. We have noted one geographical point as to which the notes seem to indicate some confusion: this is a failure to distinguish adequately the three forts called Fort Loudoun, one of which was in Western Pennsylvania, one at Winchester, Virginia, and one in what is now Tennessee, near the Tellico River. The form of the volume is most pleasing. The only illustrations, besides maps, are photographs of the statue of Pitt erected in 1769 by the Commons House of Assembly of South Carolina, and of the portrait of Chatham from the Gardiner Hubbard collection. It is to be hoped that this excellent beginning may lead to further efforts of the same kind, and that this and other patriotic societies may continue to co-operate with the States and with the Library of Congress in rendering accessible to the ever-increasing number of students of Colonial history the sources upon which the writing of that history must depend.

Among Crowell's recent publications are new editions of two of Clifton Johnson's books illustrative of New England rural life in the nineteenth century, "The Country School," and "The Farmer's Boy," which are quite worthy of being thus perpetuated. Mr. Johnson is both an author and an illustrator of books, and in these two volumes, it is an open question to which the reader owes the greater debt, for the descriptions of the various phases of rural life depicted—the pen of the writer, or the pencil and camera of the artist. The scenes depicted are as ancient as the beginning of the nineteenth century in some cases, and the moods of New England life are as varied as the seasons. Mr. Johnson's sympathy with the life he describes is apparent on every page, and the books will be valuable in days to come as throwing side-lights upon economic conditions in New England after those conditions have wholly passed away.